REPORT RESUMES

ED 003 425 24

PROCEEDINGS OF THE ALLERTON PARK CONFERENCE ON RESEARCH IN THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH, DECEMBER 2-4, 1962.

BY- WASSON, RICHARD
ILLINOIS UNIV., URBANA

REPORT NUMBER CRP-G-006 PUB DATE 62
CONTRACT OEC-3-10-058
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.27 HC-$5.32 133P.

DESCRIPTORS- *ENGLISH, ENGLISH CURRICULUM, ENGLISH INSTRUCTION, SEMINARS, TEACHER SEMINARS, *RESEARCH PROJECTS, *ORGANIZATION, *COLLEGE INSTRUCTION, *CONFERENCES, MONTICELLO, ILLINOIS, URBANA, PROJECT ENGLISH

ABOUT 80 CHAIRMEN OR OTHER REPRESENTATIVES FROM COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY DEPARTMENTS OF ENGLISH WERE INVITED TO A SEMINAR AT ALLERTON PARK, MONTICELLO, ILLINOIS, DECEMBER 2-4, 1962. EFFORTS WERE MADE TO INSURE A GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION, AS WELL AS REPRESENTATION FROM VARIOUS KINDS OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES. THE SPECIFIC CONCERN OF THE SEMINAR WAS WITH A PROGRAM KNOWN AS "PROJECT ENGLISH," ADMINISTERED BY THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FORMAL PROCEEDINGS, MOST OF THE PAPERS PRESENTED, NAMES OF THE PARTICIPANTS, AND RESOLUTIONS (REPRESENTING IN ALMOST EVERY INSTANCE THE UNANIMOUS OPINION OF THE PARTICIPANTS) ARE INCLUDED IN THIS REPORT. (JC)

Proceedings

of

THE ALLERTON PARK CONFERENCE ON RESEARCH IN THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH

December 2-4, 1962

Robert W. Rogers, Seminar Director

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

Sponsored by

THE UNITED STATES OFFICE OF EDUCATION

In Cooperation With

THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

Project #G-1006

Contract No. OE 3-10-058

Prepared by

Richard Wasson

ED 003425

Proceedings

of

THE ALLERTON PARK CONFERENCE ON RESEARCH IN THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH

December 2-4, 1962

Robert W. Rogers, Seminar Director

3414R

(24)

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK- NOT FILMED

PREFACE

The seminar, sponsored by the United States Office of Education, Cooperative Research Project #G-006 (Contract No. OE 3-10-058 with the University of Illinois), was held at Allerton Park, Monticello, Illinois, December 2-4, 1962. Some eighty chairmen or other representatives from college and university departments of English were invited after every effort to insure geographical distribution as well as representation from various kinds of colleges and universities.

The seminar took place at a time when there was a general demand for better English instruction in schools and colleges, a demand which was very much on the minds of the participants. Their specific concern was the program known as "Project English" administered by the United States Office of Education and sponsoring cooperative research of varied kinds. The discussions ranged widely, however; and participants in the seminar arrived at conclusions having significance for the profession.

The formal proceedings of the seminar are reprinted here. Most of the speeches are reproduced in their entirety; two are summarized. Resolutions representing in almost every instance the unanimous opinions of those attending, together with the names of the participants, conclude this report.

Robert W. Rogers
University of Illinois

7 February 1963

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK- NOT FILMED

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

PREFACE ii

OPENING REMARKS, Robert W. Rogers 1

THE RELATION OF COLLEGE ENGLISH DEPARTMENTS IN RELATION TO OTHER GROUPS INTERESTED IN THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH, James R. Squire 5

REMARKS FOR ALLERTON HOUSE SEMINAR, John H. Fisher 17

WHAT COOPERATIVE RESEARCH HAS DONE FOR OTHER SUBJECTS: WHAT IT CAN DO FOR ENGLISH, Francis A. J. Ianni 23

RESEARCH IMPERATIVES IDENTIFIED BY THE CONFERENCE AT CARNEGIE INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, Erwin R. Steinberg . . 35

THE PRESENT STATUS OF RESEARCH IN THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH, George Winchester Stone, Jr. 42

RESEARCH IN COMPOSITION, Harold C. Martin 54

RESEARCH IN THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LINGUISTICS (A SUMMARY), Albert H. Marckwardt 63

RESEARCH IN THE TEACHING OF READING AND LITERATURE WHAT COLLEGE ENGLISH DEPARTMENTS CAN DO, J. N. Hook . . . 66

RESEARCH DESIGN WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH, N. L. Gage 77

EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY AND RESEARCH IN THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH, David H. Russell 88

THE RELATIONSHIP OF ENGLISH EDUCATION AND RESEARCH IN THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH, Dwight L. Burton 96

ENGLISH PROFESSORS AND THE SCHOOLS, Jean H. Hagstrum . . . 107

Page

COORDINATING EFFORTS AND ORGANIZING ENGLISH DEPARTMENTS TO SUPPORT RESEARCH IN THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH ... or CONFESSIONS OF AN EX-CHAIRMAN ... or I WAS A TEEN-AGE CHAIRMAN--UNTIL I FOUND GOD (AND CHICAGO), James E. Miller, Jr. 110

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT A SEMINAR OF ENGLISH DEPARTMENT CHAIRMEN, Held at Allerton Park, December 2-4, 1962 118

PROGRAM OF MEETINGS 124

OPENING REMARKS

Robert W. Rogers

I want to welcome all of you to Illinois and to Allerton Park.

This Seminar is but one of many responses of the profession to a series of demands for better English instruction in our schools and colleges. No one can surely believe that all is perfect at the present time or, indeed, at any time. Evidence of failure seems to appear in our own classrooms every day. That important document, The National Interest and the Teaching of English, has illustrated many of the conditions actually prevailing in our schools; and one wonders what further horrors will be revealed if a similar survey is made of American colleges and universities. Our professional and learned societies, aware that high standards of scholarship depend upon teaching in the schools and colleges that will insure a supply of articulate and well trained students, have become deeply concerned with the problem and with solutions to it.

There has, to be sure, been no lack of speculation about the causes of the present situation. We are told that the troubles are occasioned by poorly trained and/or overworked teachers, by disinterestedness on the part of subject-matter specialists or by their ignorance of the learning process, or by the presumption of methodologists who have meddled in curricular matters. Naturally there have been as many proposed remedies as diagnoses of the ailment. Since the focal point of English instruction is always the teacher, many of the remedies have to do with their preparation and enrichment. All of us are familiar with the summer institutes sponsored by the Commission on English. The number of these institutes was so limited that they could create but a small ripple on the ocean of ignorance; but the results seem to have been sufficiently promising to indicate that similar undertakings on a massive scale may achieve something. Another proposal for improving the quality of English instruction in the schools calls for the establishment of a Ph.D. in the teaching of English. Such a degree would be designed for those wishing to interest themselves in the teaching of methods or for those who may become state and city supervisors of English programs. Clearly the traditional Ph.D. does not equip one for leadership in elementary and secondary school systems; but one can wish that persons who will have such leadership will have something more than the training which the programs leading to a doctoral degree in education usually provide. Finally, there is the question always gnawing at our consciences, the extent to which our traditional Ph.D. programs can and do equip the average graduate student in English for a useful career in college teaching.

One set of approaches to the problem of providing better English instruction calls for more "research" into the educational process through studies of English curricula and through experiments with various pedagogical techniques. Substantial encouragement for this kind of endeavor has come with the establishment of "Project English" within the United States Office of Education; and the main directions for the "research" have been set forth in the report of the conference held at the Carnegie Institute of Technology last May. It is the specific business of this Seminar to consider what our departments, which are subject-matter departments, can contribute to the kinds of studies "Project English" proposes to sponsor. We may, however, interpret this charge loosely: we may wish to utter judgments on the kind and quality of the projects proposed; and since "Project English" is but one of a set of closely related attacks on a very large and complex problem, we may wish to consider these other efforts.

The implementation of any or all of the proposals raises a number of practical and theoretical questions. We shall have a great deal of missionary work to do with our senior faculty members. It will not be enough to set our second-raters upon these projects; we shall have to persuade our best minds to become interested in them. We shall have to encourage them to take a constructive interest in the activities of the federal office of education, which may have the ultimate responsibility for distributing many millions of dollars in support of English instruction; and we shall have to get them to express themselves in ways that count with respect to pending legislation authorizing a National Humanities Foundation. We will have to dislodge them from their favorite 10:00 A.M. slots and persuade them to offer courses when teachers who are occupied from 8:00 A.M. to 4:00 P.M. can take them. Not a small portion of the sometimes swollen enrollments in education courses results less from the attractiveness of the courses than from the attractiveness of the times when these courses are offered. Educationists seem not to object to evening and late afternoon seminars for teachers and administrators, to Saturday classes, to extension offerings that regularly take them (by train or plane) two or three hundred miles each week.

We shall also have to re-examine our traditional criteria for promotion. If we call upon any faculty member to perform a service we consider important, he has a right to receive the kinds of recognition academic life can offer--rank and salary. Are we ready to pay more than lip service to the need for greater participation in teacher-training programs and to make it possible for a good man in such programs to rise as rapidly through the hierarchy as the good man who publishes frequently?

Most of our colleagues are willing enough to acknowledge the sorry state of present affairs; but those who could do the most are more ready to curse the darkness than to light candles. Sometimes their reluctance stems from the conviction that participation in teacher-training programs is inimical to scholarship, which is the principal business of a university faculty. They forget that the best scientists have been working with the schools for some years, that Northrop Frye and Maynard Mack have done so in English. No one can, I think, notice any diminution in the quality of the work of the scientists or Northrop Frye or Maynard Mack in consequence. More frequently, I suspect, the reluctance of our colleagues to join in the effort arises from uncertainty about what they can do rather than from any absolute unwillingness to do anything. Here we, as chairmen, are perhaps responsible for the uncertainty and doubt. We may ourselves be confused. In part, our uncertainties are understandable: they arise from a lack of convincing answers to important questions. All of us must have asked whether or not the proposals before us represent the best response we can give to the present challenge. Are the measures proposed both bold and imaginative enough? Have present difficulties been properly identified and defined with sufficient sharpness? Given the commitment to mass education and the generally low level of American culture, are we really doing so badly?

Can the educational process be as easily manipulated as some proposals assume? Can the success of changes in techniques be determined in a period short enough to be practical? How reliable or necessary, in other words, can statistical proofs be regarded, especially in the more complex aspects of educational psychology? It took a score of years before it became demonstrable that so-called progressive education didn't go very far, though there were plenty of persons ready to point out _a priori_ the limitations of this approach to education.

One must note also that underlying most of the current proposals is the assumption that the English teacher must somehow alone teach the student to write well and must also assume responsibility for the ethical and aesthetic development of American youth. This is, I think, the Sunday School fallacy: the notion that if we dress up our children and send them to Sunday School once a week, their spiritual development is assured. Can the English teacher afford to support the notion that in comparatively few contact hours, he can teach any student to read, write, think, and speak? Our imperial ambitions and the thirst for gold should not prompt us to oversell our services; we will probably do better if we spend some of our energies persuading our colleagues in other disciplines that some of the responsibility for reading, writing, and thinking is theirs too.

These are basic questions; and they ought to be asked directly and forthrightly. One of the functions of this Seminar as it has been conceived is to develop in the light of this information some agreements among ourselves concerning the ways in which we can most effectively contribute to those programs which may lead to improved instruction. It is true that we have no official status in the profession; but it is also true that this meeting has attracted a good deal of attention. Collectively we represent large resources of learning, prestige, and wealth; and there is hope among chairmen who are not here that we may at least produce some guidelines that will be useful to them in their attempts to assimilate current proposals. What we do here, or fail to do, will be widely noticed; and we have a responsibility for producing at least some general suggestions, even though these matters are extremely complex and the time we can devote to them together here is very short indeed. Most important of all, I think, is the necessity for producing only suggestions that we can all live with and are prepared to accept for our own departments. If we declare that the most prestigious members of English departments should work in programs specifically designed for teachers, we must be prepared to "encourage" our own luminaries to do so. If we declare for a Ph.D. in the teaching of English, we must return to our own campuses and get the slow-moving curricula machinery going. If we assert that notable contributions to the work of training teachers make for valid claims to promotion, we must practice this precept in our own departments. Much more than pious statements are now required of us; what is needed are at the least statements of policy of matters of education to which we all can subscribe.

THE RELATION OF COLLEGE ENGLISH DEPARTMENTS IN RELATION TO OTHER GROUPS INTERESTED IN RESEARCH IN THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH

James R. Squire

Two months ago I published an article in which I suggested that one major barrier to improving English instruction is the lack of cooperation and good will between those who bear various kinds of responsibility for improving the teaching of English. "If only we would pull together rather than pull apart," I wrote, "we might be able to achieve the improvement that we seek."

Perhaps because of this article, a copy of which Professor Rogers included in your pre-conference kits, I have been asked today to discuss some of the groups and individuals, other than those in college English, that are directly involved in research in the teaching of English. As Executive Secretary of the National Council of Teachers of English, a professional and subject-matter organization which offers a forum for individuals interested in all aspects and all levels of English teaching, I perhaps live as continually with the diversity and disunity within our profession as anyone else in this room. Like a chameleon, my personal relationship to others in the English field changes with my surroundings. No doubt viewed as an educationist by some here today--and with some reason--I assure you that I am sometimes looked on with equally deep suspicion as "subject-matter specialist" by others--also with good reason. Labels are dangerous, I fear, for they commit us to images of persons whom we can oppose in the abstract without really knowing in person. My experience with many groups leads me to believe that intelligent, imaginative individuals interested in English teaching can work very well together, provided they have opportunity to meet--that the critical problem is not the existence of diverse groups, but the isolation of groups within our campuses and within our school hierarchy, an isolation which sometimes makes it virtually impossible for truly thoughtful people to meet together.

Having issued this warning against the dangers inherent in considering the profession of English teaching in terms of disparate groups and forces, I plan to devote this discussion to considering four classifications of professional people who can, will, and must play an important role in determining the future of the teaching of English in this country--the administrator or educational generalist, the supervisor of English, the specialist in some aspect of English, and the English education specialist. There are other groups, of course, but a discussion of the four will sufficiently identify the avenues by which decisions must be made and carried out. Although I focus in this discussion on organized groups and associations, my comments apply equally to hundreds and thousands of individuals. For we would have no organized groups or associations unless large numbers of individuals with similar interests and similar points of view found it necessary and desirable to organize into diverse groups, much as are the college English department heads at the present time. And if I do not focus directly on research in teaching English, it is only because I think we can assume that all of these groups are interested either in directing research or in disseminating the results of such research.

General Educational Groups

Within education today one finds general organizations with widely different degrees of power and influence. Former U. S. Commissioner on Education, Sterling McMurrin, recently referred to these groups as large and powerful entrenched interests standing in the way of progress in education. Foremost among these general groups, of course, is the National Education Association, to which thousands of English teachers belong but in which English remains the one major subject area not represented by a special department. The National Council of Teachers of English broke away from the NEA in 1911 when the Council was formed, and although relations between the two associations remain cordial and cooperative, the increasing strength of the NCTE at the college level during the past twenty years makes any formal rapprochement highly unlikely. However, the absence of English teachers from the formal structure of the NEA does not prevent that organization from concerning itself with English teaching, from publishing articles on English in its journals, from asking English specialists to attend its meetings, or from initiating in recent months a five-year, $500,000 English Composition Laboratory Project, directed initially by Arno Jewett, Specialist on Secondary English on leave from the Office of Education. This project seeks to study ways of improving the teaching of composition in five high school centers. The important thing to remember about the NEA is that, unlike its counterpart the American Federation of Teachers, the NEA is interested in curriculum, and in disseminating results of research to schools, and that this interest has substantially increased since Lawrence Derthick, former U. S. Commissioner of Education, accepted appointment as Assistant Secretary of the NEA. Some of you are aware, I think, of the research publications of NEA and NEA-related groups.

Paralleling the NEA in representing nationally identifiable groups are the National Catholic Education Association and the National Association for Independent Schools, both created to oversee the interests of particular kinds of schools. Both associations are interested in curriculum problems and in the implications of research; both on occasion have organized national committees or commissions on English instruction to identify problems and recommend practices which seem appropriate to the schools in each group. The NCEA appointed such a commission this year; the problems identified for study and research at its first meeting read not unlike many that have been discussed by other elementary, secondary, and college teachers.

Important, too, are the general administrative groups, such as the Department of Elementary School Principals (NEA), the National Association of Secondary-School Principals (NASSP), and the American Association of School Administrators (AASA)--the major associations representing school principals and superintendents in this country. Of these, the secondary school principals have recently displayed more interest in English than have the other two associations. Only two years ago the NASSP published a position paper on "The English Language Arts in the Secondary School," based upon a conference of specialists called in Washington, D.C. For some years, too, the NCTE has planned a co-sponsored program at NASSP conventions for the purpose of informing administrators about current trends. Most such groups operate at the state level, too. In California, for example, I learned that the state secondary administrators formed a state Commission on the English Curriculum two years ago and that this state association last year investigated the NCTE, the Commission on English of College Entrance Examination Board, and the California Association of Teachers of English without communicating with anyone in these groups--a singular example of unintentional lack of cooperation. It is a pleasure, however, to tell you that all three organizations have been "passed." With the increasing attention that English is receiving, it appears that the AASA, the key organization for school superintendents, may direct somewhat more of its concern to our field. Indeed the organization is currently scheduling at its convention a closed circuit television program especially planned for superintendents.

The important fact to remember about these general educational and administrative groups is that by their very nature they are concerned with the totality of education, with maintaining balance between all aspects of education, with relating English to other subjects. Normally, the decisions made in these groups will be made by generalists rather than specialists, although hopefully by generalists who consult with specialists if such consultation is possible. These are associations necessarily less interested in "categorical" federal aid to research and program development in separate subjects than in general aid to all subjects. And if the groups sometimes disagree with those of us who seek to strengthen our particular subject, it is not because they wish our graduates any less complete an education, but only because, from their point of view and with their information, other considerations must be weighed against the pressures from a single subject field.

Supervisors and Curriculum Consultants

Similar in overall responsibility but different in their concern for the instructional program are school supervisors and curriculum consultants. These are the individuals in elementary and secondary schools charged with guiding curricular reform, with assisting in the purchase and evaluation of textbooks, with providing new materials for teachers, with developing programs of inservice and continuing education, with disseminating results of research and sometimes with conducting it, too. At the elementary level, most supervisors like most teachers are generalists, concerned with all subjects, although occasionally one possesses special competence in reading, children's literature, or in some other aspect of the elementary English program. At the secondary level, supervisors are more often found in special subjects. Smaller districts often depend only on a general curriculum consultant.

The state and national association for supervisors is the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, to which I have heard Al Marckwardt refer as "the intelligensia" of the NEA. He is not far wrong. During my years in California, I participated in many professional and subject groups. I thought then and continue to think now that the California ASCD possessed more intelligent leaders than any other single group in that state. The reasons for this are not difficult to determine. The leaders of ASCD, especially in states like California, tend to be women. Prevented by traditional anti-feminine bias from climbing the academic ladder in our universities or the administrative ladder in our schools, they gravitate toward such highly paid, important roles as Director of Instruction or Assistant Superintendent in Charge of Instruction. Like most administrators, they tend to think in terms of the total field of education, in terms of all subjects, in terms of balance. Unlike many superintendents, however, the supervisors, especially those involved in ASCD, are especially concerned about learning, about child growth and development, and about new research in perception and cognition.

During the past three years, a noticeable change has been occurring in ASCD, as more and more emphasis has been directed toward subject areas. Thus, the February 1962 issue of Educational Leadership, the ASCD journal, was devoted almost entirely to English and about one-sixth of programs at the national ASCD conferences explored problems involved in teaching, learning, and supervising English. On the educational scene, the supervisors responsible for directing curriculum change are "key" persons.

Important, also, for their potential leadership are state and large city supervisors of English. Three years ago when I began my assignment with the Council, we had such supervisors in not more than two or three states. Today, as a result of sustained efforts by NCTE, its affiliates, and others, the number of full-time or more than half-time supervisors of English has grown to thirteen. The development is important, for only if we have respected leaders in each state department of education can we expect that English will receive continuing attention. In Texas and in New York, for example, significant statewide conferences on English are being held during the next few weeks. Whether or not in appointing such supervisors, the state school superintendents consult with the chairmen of English in the major universities, with the deans of education, or with other leaders in the field may be an indication of the extent to which we are establishing sound cooperation.

But not always are the supervisors in states and large cities as well prepared as we would like. According to a recent NCTE survey, a master's degree was required as a prerequisite to the appointment of only three-quarters of the state and large city English supervisors and a doctor's degree was mentioned only once. Although competence in subject is clearly considered in making such appointments, successful experience and demonstrated leadership ability are mentioned most frequently by supervisors asked to assess their own qualifications. Although rich in teaching and in local administrative and supervisory experience, the group as a whole seems to lack the intellectual vigor and the academic background which would impress most college English professors. The reasons are not difficult to determine; low salaries and uncertain job status militate against first rate highly-trained individuals accepting such positions. Last year, for example, I was asked to recommend to an eastern state an individual with a Ph.D. in English and with teaching experience in high school and college (and preferably in elementary school too), who would accept a job with a beginning salary of $8,000. I could think of no such person. For those of you who can, please give me the name. A large school system in California, somewhat more astute than the former state, currently offers a position beginning at $14,000.

The picture which I have drawn of subject supervision is not calculated to enhance the acceptance of such persons by most college English departments. Yet these individuals can help us almost more than any others. If their training seems less adequate than we wish, if their backgrounds in English seem suspect, if we find few of our present students interested in such positions, let me ask only that we examine the extent to which we have accepted responsibility to share in the preparation of such instructional leaders.

What programs of preparation for the Ph.D. or Ed.D. provide for achieving depth both in the subject of English and in the experiences needed for supervision?

What graduate courses do we offer to assist supervisors already in the field to extend their subject preparation?

What attempts have we made in our states and universities to establish formal or informal relationships between our departments of English and the instructional supervisors of English in states and large cities?

These questions are easy to beg; they are less easy to answer; and yet they must be answered if college English is to create any satisfactory relationship with those responsible for English supervision.

Special Interest Associations

Because the total profession of English is large, it is not surprising to find those with common concerns banned together in discrete groups. At the college level, for example, the Linguistic Society of America or the College English Association represent what I call here a specialized interest group--an organization whose concern is limited to a particular aspect or portion of the program. The number of such groups is large; here I mention only four--ACEI, IRA, NCRE, and CCCC--all different, all of importance.

ACEI, the Association for Childhood Education International, is an organization of about 90,000 members consisting of classroom teachers, supervisors, and professors of elementary education interested in the problems of early childhood and those of primary level education, namely education in grades 1, 2, and 3. These concerns of the organization invariably focus on the emotional, social, physical, and intellectual development of young people, and because teachers of early childhood education are concerned about all problems of young people and about the teaching of all subjects, so we find such global concerns to be characteristic of ACEI. But because language learning and reading in particular, occupy so much of the attention of teachers during these early elementary years, one finds much of the attention of ACEI devoted to such problems. Thus the ACEI publishes annually a highly influential list of books for classroom use, thus the ACEI tests and recommends instructional materials for use in the nation's classrooms (a valuable "consumer's report" highly regarded by the nation's schools), and thus many publications of ACEI deal with such problems in English as such interpretations of research as "Reading in the Kindergarten?" or "When Children Write." These may well be the most widely read of all publications in influencing the primary school programs. Recognizing the importance of this organization and of others in elementary English, NCTE is in the process of appointing with ACEI and other groups an ad hoc study committee representing several organizations interested in elementary education to prepare a series of position papers on aspects of the language curriculum.

IRA, the International Reading Association, although less than ten years old, is already larger than the Modern Language Association and bids fair to take on the National Council of Teachers of English if its current momentum is sustained. Consisting of those directly involved in the teaching of reading, IRA holds the allegiance of many classroom teachers (especially at the elementary level), of reading teachers in the secondary schools, of directors of reading clinics in the colleges, and of educational researchers in the field of reading. To some college English professors the interests of IRA may seem to concentrate more on "how to read" than on "what to read,"; but it is fair to say, I think, that as the organization grows, so does the periphery of its interests. If interest in the perceptual processes continues, so does an increasing concern with the reading of literature. Through The Reading Teacher, a readable, popular journal aimed primarily at the classroom teacher, and an annual report of proceedings at its convention, the IRA continues its work. At present IRA and NCTE are organizing a joint national project on reading and linguistics to make possible an interdisciplinary look at the teaching of reading with particular emphasis on the possible contribution of phonological and structural analysis.

The National Conference on Research in English, NCRE, is a more limited group which has existed since 1928. Invitational by design and limited to 100 persons, the NCRE consists primarily of researchers in the teaching of English. Historically more concerned with the learning of language and literature at the elementary and secondary level, NCRE annually prepares a series of articles reviewing research in some aspect of English teaching. Two good recent examples are

Research Design in the Language Arts by Carleton Singleton and *Children's Writing* by Alvina T. Burrows. The NCRE also publishes a biennial review of research in English progress, with the next such report scheduled for appearance in *Elementary English* in January 1964. The review has been limited largely to studies underway in departments of education and psychology, but as more and more English departments undertake important studies, its scope should be extended.

The CCCC--Conference on College Composition and Communication--I mention only to illustrate that specialized interest groups in English are not confined to the school levels. Focusing on rhetoric, composition, and language, especially in relation to freshman English, 4 C's presents a lively spring conference and publishes a quarterly which is growing in circulation and attractiveness. An independent organization within NCTE, CCCC will begin publication next December, with financial support from NCTE and help and encouragement from the MLA office and the Office of Education, an annual directory of all graduate fellowships, scholarships, and assistantships available in English, English Education, and Elementary English. This service to English departments and graduate students will offer one way of suggesting to high school teachers and to supervisors some of the opportunities which are open for advanced study. It should also assist our undergraduate majors.

Not all specialized interest groups can be mentioned here by any means. In its way, the College Entrance Examination Board and its Commission on English fall into this category, in that by its very nature the CEEB is concerned with special problems involving high school-college articulation. I dwell not on CEEB only because I assume that most of the audience is familiar with its achievements and that other speakers will subsequently discuss its institute program.

English Education Specialists

The specialist in English education, the college specialist in the teaching of English in the schools, may be a member of the department of English, a member of the department of education, or a joint appointment of both. But wherever they are most such specialists believe that in some ways "they belong to both departments, and to neither one."

The English education specialist is the person qualified in English and in education who teaches the course in methods of teaching English--whether offered in one department or the other.

Depending upon his qualifications, he may also supervise student teachers, offers graduate level work on the English curriculum, serves as coordinator of relations with the schools, organizes a special extension program for teachers of English. If in education, he normally teaches courses in secondary education in addition to his English education work; if in English, he may offer courses in rhetoric and composition or teach introductory courses in literature. Recently, the chairman of an important English department in a good small college asked me to recommend a specialist who could both offer the work in methods, meet with teachers in the schools, and teach a seminar on Spenser! You can see something of the ambiguous role in which the English education specialist serves.

Recognizing the unique problems of this specialist, the NCTE is calling next spring a special national conference at Indiana University to discuss many of the problems. We expect about 150 persons to attend. In the meantime, a Committee of the Council has just completed a rather complex questionnaire survey of the field. The findings reveal, for example, that about half of these specialists are assigned to English departments and about half to education, that about three in five have the doctorate degree and that of those who do, 76 per cent hold the Ph.D. and only 24 per cent the Ed.D. In addition to teaching the methods course, the major responsibilities of these specialists appear to be teaching teachers through workshops, institutes, conferences, and extension courses.

The major problem identified in the survey, aside from the problem of finding time to discharge the varied responsibilities of the course, relate to the ambiguous status of this specialist on many campuses. Not always completely accepted as performing an important role either by English or by education, the English education specialist too often finds himself a "lonely man." Separated by his interest in subject from his associates in education, he too often finds himself isolated from colleagues in English by his concern with learning, educational research, and curriculum development. Some indication of his isolation from scholarship in English may be gleaned from analyzing the associations to which he belongs:

79%	NCTE
68%	State English Association
33%	Conference on College Composition
17%	IRA
24%	Modern Language Association

I am pleased, of course, to see that high degree of affiliation with the Council; I am disturbed at the lack of participation and interest in our scholarly sister association.

I mention these facts because I believe they reveal clearly some of the problems which college English departments must face if they wish to assume some responsibility for improving research in English instruction. Clearly the specialist in English education stands between the academic preparation offered in our departments and the practical application in the schools. Clearly, too, research in the teaching of English must be based on both. Whether the English education specialist stands as a bridge or a barrier depends somewhat on how departments of English view their responsibilities. Let me raise only a problem or two.

To what extent should departments of English share responsibility for seeking and recommending the appointment of the specialist in English education, whether or not the appointment is to be within the department?

To what extent do departments of English assume responsibility for inviting the English education specialist to sit in on departmental functions--regardless of whether his appointment is in English or education?

To what extent do the departments of English offer programs to assist in preparing English education specialists? From what sources other than English will come the English education specialists of tomorrow if we are not equal to the task? Clearly the traditional Ph.D. in English seems not to offer adequate preparation for the diverse responsibilities of the English education specialist any more than does the traditional Ed.D. in education. Like the state supervisor of English, college specialists in the teaching of English require unique training in research, in subject content, and in pedagogy.

To what extent are the college departments of English prepared to support the validity and importance of a specialized course in methods of teaching English taught by a person qualified in both English and education? The evidence now being analyzed by President Conant in his study of teacher education and the results of virtually all surveys indicate the supreme value of such a specialized methods course to teachers, when offered by someone qualified in English. In the anxiety over reducing course credits in education required for the secondary and perhaps elementary credential, we may sometimes threaten to throw out the baby with the bath water. Failing often to distinguish between the specialized teacher education course in methods and the other work in professional education, most of which is not methods at all, we permit generalists either to combine the specialized English education work with more generalized and less well received courses or to reduce it to the status of an elective offering.

To offer support at a time when support is needed, the College Section Committee of the NCTE and the Executive Committee of CCCC are releasing a resolution of support for the specialized methods courses which I hope the national college English chairmen will consider carefully and then support in their own institutions.

Conclusion

I have attempted to describe some of the organizations and individuals with which college departments must work in undertaking research in the teaching of English. No matter what we decide at this conference, no matter how we prefer to work, individuals similar to those I have described are now devoting their professional careers to the improvement of instruction. They are individuals who will be affected by our decision concerning the teaching of English. They are, therefore, individuals who must share in the decision-making process. My own experience tells me that they are only too willing to cooperate in any intelligent ways.

It would be wrong, I think, to assume that all decisions which have been made up to this moment, or this year, or the last five years, were made without respect to college professors of English. Oscar Campbell, C. C. Fries, Porter Perrin, Lennox Grey, John Gerber, and others have served as presidents of the NCTE. Warner Rice, Al Marckwardt, Horst Frenz, Lewis Leary, Nelson Francis have long been active as key committee chairmen. A large majority of those present in this room are presently involved in NCTE work, and hundreds of others have and will continue their support. It is in each state, each region, and each institution that the real cooperation needs to be strengthened, for the cooperation between college English, college education, and the schools, so manifest in national English activities, is too seldom apparent locally. To be sure, the seeds of distrust planted over many years will have to be overcome. To be sure, college English professors willing to work on educational problems in their local areas may find their advances met by skepti--cism and doubt. To be sure, some of the local leaders in supervision, administration, and English education may be less well educated in English than we would like. But the question that we in college English need to ask ourselves is not whether we are accepting this situation but what are we doing about it. What are we doing to insure greater cooperation and joint effort between all persons concerned with English education? What are we doing to extend and deepen the English background of individuals currently in leadership roles in our schools? What are we doing to provide leadership for the curriculum reform that we all so earnestly desire? What are we doing and willing to do for those on our faculties ready and willing to undertake research in the teaching of English?

REMARKS FOR ALLERTON HOUSE SEMINAR

John H. Fisher

The fact that you have been willing to take time from your busy lives to assemble here underscores the importance of this meeting. This and the conference of chairmen at MLA four weeks from now could mark the beginning of a new pattern of action in American education. Just what this pattern will be, or should be, remains to be seen. But of one thing I feel sure. If the plans and policy that English chairmen establish are to be viable, they must take account of the issues confronting us. Rationalization, unseemly eagerness to drink from the public trough, betrayal of our real convictions will in the end hurt us more than they will help us.

The three issues on which I feel that there has been muddy thinking are the parallels between the situations in English, science, and the foreign languages, which has led us to put institutes and curriculum development so high on our list of priorities for an English program; the failure to recognize that the problems in English grow rather from the national attempts to provide high school, and now college education, for all the children of all the people; and, finally, from our own professional schizophrenia--our failure to reconcile our interest in literature for its own sake with the pedestrian and high utilitarian demands placed upon English language arts in general education.

I

Let me begin with the difference between English, science, and the foreign languages. The fact that science and languages are supported by a National Defense Education Act is no accident. The National Science Foundation and National Defense Education Act are the direct results of the discovery of nuclear fission and the development of rocketry. I am not speaking of vague impulses, but of direct and specific cause and effect. Review the dates. Recall the poverty of physics in the 1930's, when splitting the atom was still a fitting subject for comedians' jokes. The Manhattan Project during the war demonstrated the feasibility not only of the atom bomb, but of crash programs by teams of scientists lavishly supported. For a short time after August 6, 1945, when we alone had the bomb, we were at the top of the heap. At this point there were no questions about the efficacy of our educational system. But the achievement of atomic explosion by the Russians in 1949 proved that science was not static, and that we could maintain our lead only by a continuation of organized effort. The formation of the National Science Foundation in 1950 was in response to this national concern, and all of its activities since that time have been dedicated to the eminently practical, useful, concrete, demonstrable ends of scientific research and development. Its attitude towards American education is about the same as that of General Motors--it is a consumer of the product, and its reactions to the product are best exemplified in attitudes of Admiral Rickover: that American education is doing a miserable job, and that educators are on the whole stupid and incompetent. If they weren't, they wouldn't be educators. They would be research scientists or administrators. The NSF's forays into education have been shaped by these attitudes. With virtually limitless funds at its command ($176,000,000 in 1961), it has sought to re-train teachers and produce "teacher-proof" materials, by-passing the normal teacher-training agencies and school administrations. We are right back to the situation of the late Middle Ages, when the popes tried to save Christians from their ignorant and indolent parish priests by creating the competing mendicant orders. And the results are destined to be the same. Because they recognized the cure of souls as their central responsibility, because they were always on hand performing their functions, the parish priests simply outlasted the friars, as the teachers college and local school superintendent are going to outlast the NSF institutes and Mr. Zacharias.

The history of NDEA is related to sputnik in the same way that NSF is to the Russian atomic explosion. But it represents the effort of the USOE and educational bureaucracy to capitalize upon public dissatisfaction with the products of our schools to do something for education within the conventional framework. Institutes and creation of new materials on the pattern of NSF have been somewhat successful in the foreign languages. They have been less successful in counseling and guidance. And the case of English bears much more resemblance to counseling and guidance than it does to science and the foreign languages. The reason is that both technical scientific information and the audio-lingual mastery of a foreign language are specific, measurable, and generally accepted objectives. We can tell when a man can't add, read a formula, or speak a foreign language, and we can prescribe fairly specific remedies. We have a harder time telling whether he is an effective guide and counsellor, and very much more difficulty in prescribing a remedy. Frequently the only remedy is to go get himself a new personality or to go get a job as a bus driver.

Well, not to belabor this first point any further, I think that in discussing the situation of English we should begin by recognizing that it is very different from that of the sciences and languages. National programs in science are essentially directed to such visible and vital goals as building atomic power plants and landing on the moon. Their interest in education is peripheral. It amounts to trying to recruit and help train more people to be scientists and technicians. National programs in the foreign languages have (at this stage, at least) as their final objectives a skill in the use of the language hardly greater than that in English which the child brings to school with him in the first grade. Neither of these has much bearing on the broad problem of general education with which we in English are faced.

II

Before I turn to this problem of English and general education, however, I should like to remind you of the changing role of general education in college, and specifically in our English departments. Figures about the population explosion and the altered basis of our tax structure are all too familiar. But they are the reason that you are sitting here today; so they are not irrelevant. Recall first of all that in 1920, 70 cents of the tax dollar was collected and spent at the state level and 30 cents at the federal level. These figures are now reversed. So if any greater percent of our national income is to be spent on education, much of it is going to come from Washington. The NSF and NDEA, and before them the Smith-Hughes Agricultural and Vocational Education Act, have all established the precedent in Congress of "categorical assistance"--that is, assistance to special areas with strings attached. This principle the NEA is fighting with every weapon at its disposal. I suppose that as a subject-matter group, we in English favor the continuation of categorical assistance. But when and if it comes to English as it has to the sciences and languages, much will depend upon the way that it is administered. Government is in the end a very personal process, in which prejudices and friendships play a decisive part. In a democracy, we are--or should be--the government. Nearly all of the contacts or the USOE have in the past been with administrators and professional educators. (The Language Development Section of NDEA has been the noteworthy exception.) With Nick Hook and Don Tuttle in the Office and with Bob Pooley, Al Kitzhaber, myself and others serving on committees, we have begun to establish contacts between English scholars and the USOE. But this must go much further. Because he has been willing to devote days and weeks to it, Jim Squire has become one of the most influential people in English in Washington. Al Marckwardt, Floyd Rinker, and a few others know and are known in the marble halls of HEW. But that is not enough. The executive members of any Conference of English Chairmen are going to have to make it their responsibility to get to know the Washington scene intimately. And each of you as an individual chairman and scholar must take every opportunity to become familiar with both the fauna and the flora in Washington. One of the most important opportunities of the present meeting is for you to get to know Fritz Ianni and the other members of USOE at this meeting, and have them get to know you.

But that federal aid is inevitable and that how it is administered is crucial are the minor premises. The major premise is that the provision of federal aid to English at any level will come not in response to a national desire to provide more scholars of Chaucer and Shakespeare (our equivalent of research physicists and chemists), nor to improve English teachers' skill in public speaking or creative writing (rough equivalents, possibly, to audio-lingual training for foreign language teachers). It will come, rather, in recognition of the long-term deterioration of the standards and program of the public high schools. This deterioration has been going on since compulsory education laws and our national faith in education decreed that all students should have a high school education. Since financial support for elementary and secondary school education did not increase in proportion to the load, and since many of the students did not have ability for or interest in academic work, a high school program had to be devised that could be taught by inferior teachers to uninterested students under impossible working conditions. This is, I think, a fair description of what has been wrong with the high schools. The marvel is that so many excellent and dedicated teachers have been willing to endure its environment, and that so many good students have emerged from it. But the good teachers and students have not set the tone for the schools. That has been set by the academically indifferent mass. Now, we in college could afford to remain aloof as long as few of the indifferent mass came on to college. In 1924 something like 10% of the high school population went on to college; in 1950 something like 30%; this fall, some 59%. We are beginning to get many of the indifferent mass in our college classrooms, and we will get more. Is it any wonder that we are beginning to feel a sympathy for the high school problem that we have never felt before?

National interest in improving English is, therefore, related only indirectly to the cold war and to the scientific advances of the last decade. It arises more directly from a belated recognition of the desperate situation of our public schools, and from a growing recognition that shortage of academic facilities and qualified teachers and increasing enrollments in colleges and graduate schools (in 1930, 53,500 degrees of all types were awarded; in 1962, 90,200 masters and doctors degrees) could lead to the same debasement of higher education that has been going on for years in the lower schools. Project English is less a program for improving the teaching of English than it is for devising ways of merely holding our own.

III

This brings us to the final aspect of the problem: the place of English in our educational system. Since we cannot point towards such vital, temporal concerns as atomic energy or the exploration of space, what are our objectives? Quite aside from Congress and the voting public, how are we to justify ourselves to ourselves in this age of heroic scientific achievement? No one questions that there should always be a few scholars of Milton and Emerson, as of Homer and Plato. But surely we do not justify the enormous concentration on English by citing a national need for more literary scholars. We don't claim even to train novelists and playwrights. By continuing to staff freshman English courses we acknowledge that part of our task is to train students to read and write, but from high school on we base our major claim upon the supposedly humanistic value of understanding the language, forms, and ideas of imaginative literature. I submit that until we in college departments can come to grips sincerely and realistically with the uses of literature and the relationship between literary study and the teaching of literacy, we can take no meaningful part in a national program for the improvement of English.

I realize that by stating the question in this way I run a severe risk of being misunderstood. Belief in the value of literary study for all is the creed we live by. It provides whatever sense of identity we have as a profession. On this, and little aside from this, textual scholars, biographers and new critics can unite. The anthropology that underlies the axiom--its inheritance from the aristocratic and theological traditions of another era--need not detain us here. As scientific modes of thought have advanced and figurative modes have declined, the importance of literature as an academic subject has become increasingly difficult to justify. Matthew Arnold was nobly sad in his conviction that religious values must be replaced by literary taste--F. R. Leavis is merely shrill. Whatever its subliminal basis, however, the belief is real. I share it. But I know that those of us who share it are a chosen few. Those who don't are laymen--or social scientists of some stripe or hue.

Now the aspect of English training that laymen, scientists, and social scientists all agree on is literacy: the ability to read directions accurately and to write clear, coherent exposition. When they deplore English training, these are the skills they are thinking of. It is to improve training in these skills that money has already been made available and will be made available in the future. I end, therefore, with a question. Is the dichotomy between training in literary appreciation and in "communication skills" absolute? Can the literary study to which we are dedicated be made to serve the national interest more directly without being destroyed? This seems to me the crucial question before us. Let us not be glib in our answer. It would be easy enough to turn ourselves into enormous service departments of composition and the language arts. Is this really what is being asked of us? If so, I tender my resignation on the spot. But resigning would only leave a vacuum to be filled by someone else who is quite willing to be of service. Surely there must be a viable compromise between what we love and know is valuable and the very real and worsening crisis in our efforts to teach students and prepare others to teach students to read and write.

That viable compromise, gentlemen, is what you are here to discuss. It will not be achieved by platitudes, no matter how true, nor by avoidance of the real issues. You represent the pick of the English profession. If meaningful advice can be given, you can give it. But you must be willing to give it your all.

WHAT COOPERATIVE RESEARCH HAS DONE FOR OTHER SUBJECTS: WHAT IT CAN DO FOR ENGLISH

Francis A. J. Ianni

I came here today both in the role of financial host and, I hope, welcome colleague in English; our dreams of working with you to improve the teaching of English have become so much part of our daily life in Cooperative Research that I have almost learned to appreciate John Gower. I have already learned to appreciate John Fisher, Jim Squire, Floyd Rinker, Nick Hook, Bob Rogers and all of you who have helped us get Project English off to a start. Quite simply, my purpose here today is to plead with all of you to join with us in the enterprise which has come to be known as Project English.

As you have already been told, Project English is a part of the federal concern for research in education. This federal concern for research in education might well be characterized as both long-standing and recent, diverse and yet narrowly focused. These seeming paradoxes result from both the utilitarian nature of the governmental interest in research and the traditionally conservative role which education has played in American culture. Education is a social process so vital to the preservation of a society that it will go on despite all obstacles. Thus, what educators do not know, they will simply guess. Even in a nation and an era where progress has become a goal in itself, and research the recognized means to this goal, research in education has never had the same urgency for the mind politic as research related to the needs of medicine, agriculture, the national defense, or even the Fish and Wildlife Service. As a consequence, research has been ignored in most schemes of educational improvement and efforts directed toward progress in education have generally centered around the provision of more of what already exists--more classrooms, more books, more courses, more visual aids--and the improvement of teachers who are not using what little is already known about education. Though the Constitution says nothing about a federal responsibility for education, such a situation would seem to demand attention from the national government in its broad charge for the national welfare. With the possible exception of some professional educators themselves, most educationally oriented interest groups today recognize the need for federal support of educational research as a part of the new federal concern for science. This concern, however, has tended to concentrate on social science and ignore social studies.

Actually, the interest of the national government in both scientific research and education has a respectable antiquity. While we often assume that governmental interest in science and educational improvement was launched with Sputnik I, our nation has long encouraged both scientific endeavour and educational enterprises. The creation of the Smithsonian Institution in 1846, the Morrill Act establishing the land-grant colleges in 1862, the founding of the National Academy of Sciences in 1863, and the United States Office of Education in 1867 all give evidence of this concern early in our national history. In more recent years, the emergence of the Office of Naval Research in 1946, the National Institutes of Health in 1938, the National Defense Education Act of 1948, the National Science Foundation in 1950, and the Cooperative Research Program of the United States Office of Education in 1956 are new evidences of continued interest.

As one looks back over this chronology, however, one salient fact emerges: in each case the motivating factor, or at least the manifest motivation, has been the enhancement of the national interest or purpose as conceived in broadly utilitarian terms. Thus research in agriculture, stimulated under the Morrill Act and developed under the Hatch Act of 1887 which brought about the agricultural experiment stations, was made palatable to the nation not as a science but, rather, as a means of improving agricultural productivity in both quantity and quality. But while it is becoming increasingly possible to obtain Congressional approval for research and development funds for remedial programs for the deaf, the blind, the mentally retarded, the delinquent, and even the gifted, appropriations for research and development in the area of the improvement of the quality of education have been difficult and in some cases impossible to obtain. Even today, foreign language and area training and research programs must be sold to the Congress not in their true social studies context but rather as a means of bolstering the national defense and to get on in a world grown perilously small.

Certainly some of the causes of this failure to view scientific inquiry into educational problems as vital to the national and individual interest are inherent in the lack of drama in educational research--no congressman's daughter has ever died of a split infinitive and who among us is prepared to rally patriotically to the defense of Miss Johnson's English class. But in large measure, educational research has failed to catch the political and public imagination because it has been unimaginative and, until recent years, almost wholly restricted to doctoral dissertations and small, uninteresting research projects. Think back over the years to the significant innovations in educational practice, and you will find, I believe, that all too often they grew out of the experience and insight of an individual or the pressure of society rather than the findings of educational research.

Federal Support for Educational Research

The growth patterns of the federal subsidy for research and development also reveal the lowly status of educational research in the United States. Viewed in comparison to amounts available for research in other areas, educational research funds are meagre. In the decade 1951 to 1961, a total of $80 billion was expended by all sectors of the economy on research and development. The growth of the proportion of these costs assumed by the government in this impressive outlay is indicated by the fact that in the first year of this decade, the federal share of the costs was about one-half of the total, but by 1961 it had risen to over two-thirds where it remains today. In dollar figures, this represents a total federal budgetary obligation of $12 billion, 400 million for all research and development activities in fiscal 1963. Our present projections indicate that the proportion of all research and development costs borne by the national government will rise to three-fourths of all such expenditures by fiscal year 1970. What happens after that is largely a matter of the political orientation of the forecaster, but it seems safe to assume that the federal government will continue as the dominant source of support for research and development. The value orientation of the reader is also a factor in any attempt to assess how educational research has fared as a result of this $80 billion decade.

Setting aside the portion of federal research and development funds which go for developmental work and purely applied research, the National Science Foundation estimates that the total federal expenditures for basic research in fiscal year 1961, exclusive of government sponsored research centers administered by universities, was about $969 million of which 25% was expended on intramural research. Of the remaining three-fourths, or $727 million, about $400 million was awarded in grants or contracts to educational institutions for research.[1] Almost all of this amount was contributed by the seven principal sponsors of research in educational institutions--the Department of Defense (about 40%), the National Science Foundation (about 11%), the Atomic Energy Commission (about 8%), the Department of Agriculture (about 6%), the National Aeronautics and Space Agency (about 3%), and the Public Health Service (about 30%), and the Office of Education (about 2%) within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. If it is assumed that any research which improves the competence of American educators is essentially educational research then most of the money expended by these agencies must be assigned to educational research, but realistically, a very small portion of these monies is actually given for purely educational research. As a matter of fact, if one makes the justifiable assumption that the Office of Education is the principal agency which supplies support for studies of the process of education, then we may safely say that just two percent of the total amount of research funds given to educational institutions is for educational research. To further narrow our focus, if the categorical research support programs such as the Newer Educational Media Program of the NDEA are excluded, the Office of Education's share falls to less than one percent. In this year 1961, the Cooperative Research Program, the principal granting agency within the Office for non-categorical educational research, had a budget of $3.6 million, of which over $3 million was necessary to pay the continuation costs of previous years so that in actuality, a total of less than $500 thousand was available for new research.

---

[1] By way of comparison of the relative role of research as a source of federal support in institutions of higher learning, it is interesting to note that of the approximately $1 billion expended in such institutions by the government in 1960, about $450 million went for research, $488 million for scholarships and fellowships, $17 million for various programs of instruction, and $44 million for facilities. Of this $450 million, 94% was spent in only 100 institutions.

It seems needless to point out that this is a pitifully small amount of money for so important an enterprise. But I cannot help but suggest that perhaps we are getting just about what we deserve in terms of education's own vision of the need for educational innovation. Educators are prone to talk about the need for "big money" in educational research while clinging to small plans for innovation. It has become fashionable, for example, to deplore the fact that while many industries spend up to one-third of their budget on research, educational research and development expenditures amount to less than 1/10 of one percent of total annual expenditures on education in the United States. But progress in education requires more than just additional money. Before we can even consider seeking the sums now expended on research in health or agriculture, for example, we must broaden the frontier of experimentation in education and create a pervasive professional mood which not only accepts innovation, but seeks and welcomes it. Herein, I believe, lies the challenge for leadership. As in all areas, leadership, if it is to be enlightened leadership, requires research and development. The question now becomes: Has educational leadership--specifically in social studies--been given this type of stimulation? I think not; let me illustrate from my own program.

The Cooperative Research Program of the United States Office of Education is a relatively recent addition to the growing number of federal funding programs. The post World War II period had ushered in some small awareness of the great need for adequate scientific research in education and related areas as a basis for sound educational practice and the growing recognition of this need led to the passage of Public Law 531 by the 83d Congress. This law, which was signed by the President on July 26, 1954, authorized the Commissioner of Education "to enter into contracts and jointly financed cooperative arrangements with universities and colleges and state educational agencies for the conduct of research, surveys, and demonstrations in the field of education." Although the law was passed in 1954, funds were not appropriated for its implementation until fiscal year 1957. For the first year of operation, approximately one million dollars was appropriated; for the second year it was increased to $2.3 million. Since that time the budgetary appropriations have continued to grow and in fiscal year 1963, the budget for the Program, exclusive of some special foreign currency items, is $7 million.

In the early years, the Program was focused on ten areas of research interest which the Office of Education considered particularly important, although projects on other important aspects of education were also supported. In recent years, however, the Program has encouraged and received applications from the wide spectrum of research interests relevant to education. As a result, the research areas serviced by the Program has expanded rapidly and today research is being supported in many fields of basic knowledge which hold promise of important contributions to educational knowledge. This diversification has led to the involvement of growing numbers of behavioral and social scientists in the research sponsored by the Program as sociologists, psychologists, anthropologists, political scientists, philosophers, economists, and others have joined with educational researchers in addressing themselves to the problems of education. Equally as important as its role in attracting new research talent to educational problems, the Program has also served as the primary source for providing research situations for the training of young educational researchers and the continued support of established researchers.

Results of great significance are constantly emerging from our 500 studies in such areas as the identification and development of gifted students, language achievements of the mentally retarded, teaching spatial concepts to blind children, motivations of youth for leaving school, relationship of school experiences to juvenile delinquency, effects of various teaching methods on the achievement of elementary school children, cross-cultural studies of education, development of language and of reading skills in young children, economics of higher education, social climates in the schools, financing of education in urban areas, how children form social circles, and improving the effectiveness of college teaching. In each case, a research project at a college, university, or state education agency has provided these important findings.

But despite the obvious promise of these important findings, it would be less than honest to suggest that they have had any widespread effect on American educational practice. Despite one study which has developed a technique to teach blind children to "read" by ear at four times the rate possible by the braille method, braille still continues as the principal method of teaching the blind; despite over 70 studies the traditional patterns of the teaching-learning process have remained unchanged except for occasional minor refinements, usually in the direction of reinforcement of existing methods, and the chronological creep from kindergarten through college remains inviolate over the years. Some progress has been made in revising the curriculum, but despite the combined efforts of the Office of Education and the National Science Foundation the new mathematics programs, for example, still have considerable resistance, at least some of which is led by national organizations of educators.

The reasons for this failure to bring about a practical realization of the promise of educational research result from the simple fact that research and development aimed at improving education has been at such a low level that it has never been taken seriously by most educators. This is as much the result of the ineptness and lack of vision of the researcher as it is the product of the educator's notorious tendency to cling tenaciously to the security of old and familiar practices. Until very recently, educational research in the social studies, for example, has not been regarded as a respectable field of endeavour by the best scholars in such fields as English, history, geography, economics, anthropology, sociology, and psychology. As a result, the responsibility for educational research in this area was left almost entirely to faculties of education, who have labored valiantly but under great handicaps and with distressingly small results. Faced with the scorn of his more respectable colleagues in the humanities, and the natural and social sciences, the educationist has retreated to the small, manageable research project, most of which have been on such a small scale, so fragmented, and often on such minor subjects, that the really critical problems of education have remained unanswered. As the scholarly community, and in more recent years, the Congress and the general public, have chided the educational researcher for his lack of practical results, he has too often responded by attempting to spread the mantle of science over his efforts and pronounce the well-defined and exquisitely-designed small research project approach as the only scientifically tenable one for research in education.

Now, this project-by-project approach has served educational research well as a means of establishing a firm base for the development of techniques, but the time has come to examine its present value as the unique means of gathering knowledge about the educational process. A careful scrutiny of research in the physical sciences, medicine, and the behavioral sciences, all of which are certainly further along in the improvement of research techniques than education, reveals that the project approach loses its utility when it is applied to the resolution of major problems. The project approach has proven most valuable in basic research, where the investigator has a particular hypothesis or series of hypotheses which he desires to test. Thus, the project is essentially a technique for focusing attention on some discreet problem within a relatively narrow area of interest. The identification of a particular strain of virus is an example of the project approach in medical research. A project which seeks to determine the effects of various forms of discipline on student achievement is a similar example from educational research. In both cases, the investigator is examining the interaction of variables under relatively controlled conditions. But, because of the very nature of the rigid controls necessary to basic research, the operation of these variables outside the laboratory or the experimental classroom is left unanswered unless basic research findings are field-tested in a variety of situations. And after field-testing they must be demonstrated and eventually disseminated to the practitioners before research can have any impact on practice.

These steps of basic research, field-testing, demonstration and dissemination form, along with continuous research planning and development, the basic steps in the research process. It seems relatively obvious that if new "projects" have to be mounted for each of the four steps in an area of research interest, there must be a significant loss both in time and continuity in research. Our estimate is that at the present time, the time lag between the emergence of a researchable idea and its final dissemination as a usable tool throughout the schools approaches 60 years in the field of education.

The trend in scientific research has been to move from the project approach to the next stage of research mobilization, the program approach where preplanned, continuous attention, through all steps in the research process is focused on persistent problem areas until solutions are found and translated into practice. Thus, one group of researchers follows a research program from development through demonstration. It is our belief that the Cooperative Research Program and the field of educational research are now ready to move from a project basis to a program basis in dealing with significant problems in American education. This in no way negates our belief that the research project still remains as the most valid method of conducting basic research. We simply insist that the time has come to implement the results of basic research as soon as they are available.

The first steps in this movement to a program base have already taken place in the Cooperative Research Program. In 1962, "programmed research" activities in the areas of English and talent development were introduced as a means of focusing major attention on these particular problem areas of education. In 1963, we are undertaking a major program in social studies.

In Project English, the Congress has already allocated funds for four types of activities:

1. Basic and Applied Research Projects

Staff members of colleges, universities, and state educational agencies may submit proposals to the Cooperative Research Program for projects related to English. (School districts may apply if they submit through their state agencies, which then assume responsibility for the projects.) Although many of these will focus on the improvement of instruction at various levels, more basic studies which explore the attitudes of students toward other cultures, the development of concepts of citizenship and government in children, and studies of school-community relationships, for example, are also appropriate. February 1 is the next deadline for submitting basic and applied research proposals.

2. Curriculum Study Centers

Funds are available to initiate additional curriculum study centers in English this year. The purpose of these centers are (1) to redefine the nature and aims of the curriculum, (2) to develop instructional materials and methods that will achieve specific aims, (3) to experiment with, evaluate, and revise the newly developed methods and materials, and (4) to disseminate the most promising methods and materials to interested groups. Proposals may be submitted for study centers at all levels of the curriculum. A maximum of $25,000 may be requested for the operation of each center in this fiscal year and $50,000 a year for subsequent years. Such centers would be expected to operate for a period of about 5 years. The next deadline for the submission of curriculum study center proposals in English is January 15, 1963. Proposals may be submitted after that time and will be considered at a later date.

3. Research Development Activities

Individual projects, conferences, and seminars are planned to synthesize the research that has been done in particular areas of English and to stimulate further research in this field. Although participation in such activities is by invitation only, the staff of the Cooperative Research Program would be happy to talk with individuals or groups who may have ideas for such activities.

Although these are the areas in which funds are currently available, they represent only our initial efforts in English. The Office invites interested individuals and groups to share their ideas of other activities that are needed to improve research, instruction, teacher education, and the dissemination of information in this field. We are particularly anxious in dissemination.

The Cooperative Research Program has traditionally been a source of funds for basic research. We have not and will not abandon this most important function of our program. But in an effort to both speed the dissemination of results and insure that the results disseminated have a valid basic research base, we have instituted several new programs this year aimed at the development and dissemination of educational materials. Early in 1962, a number of demonstration projects were instituted for the purpose of both testing and demonstrating the use of research results in the schools. One demonstration now under way, for example, will test the use of an enriched mathematics program with talented youngsters; another will demonstrate the feasibility of early admission to the first grade for mentally advanced children.

Another new program this year has been the establishment of curriculum study centers to develop and test promising practices and materials in English and the social studies and to produce new curricula in these subjects. Six such centers are now under way in the area of English, and we are planning at least two more this year. In coming years we will expand the centers' approach to cover the entire range of the curriculum. This year we are also letting contracts for a number of Demonstration Centers in English and in the field of identification and utilization of talent. Here our hopes are that as the results of research projects and curriculum development programs become available they can be demonstrated to teachers and administrators at these centers. This year we are starting the same approach to social studies.

We dream fondly of the coming of fiscal year 1964, for here again we have plans for extending the programmatic base of our research activities. In addition to the new program areas described above, we hope to establish a small grant program which will allow a researcher with a "hot" idea to take the necessary time to plan and develop his approach to the problem and perhaps try it out on a limited scale. In 1964, we will also establish our first Program Research Centers at a number of educational institutions. These centers financed on a long-term, full-support basis, will bring together university scholars, state education agency administrators, and teachers and administrators from the local schools to work cooperatively on total research-dissemination programs. Modeled after the agricultural experiment stations, they should help to bridge the gap between research and practice.

If we are allowed to dream on into 1965, we expect to establish a pre- and post-doctoral fellowship program, not only to upgrade the training of educational researchers but perhaps to try some new, experimental types of training such as research administrators to work on applications of research in the schools, or social work trained teachers for slum schools. In that year we would also like to develop an international exchange of educational researchers, a series of model-demonstration schools in each state, and perhaps even a number of educational laboratories within the Office of Education in conjunction with an internship program. It is in 1965 that we would like to take another step forward and establish a center for Advanced Study in Education--more than just a "think tank" for educators--in reality a center where scholars and researchers from all disciplines may come together to lend their talents to the resolution of educational problems.

We still have not given up dreaming. As a matter of fact, perhaps our biggest dream is for 1966. In that year, we hope to move to the third stage of research mobilization, a national institute program. The function of these national institutes would be to stimulate, finance, and coordinate research, demonstration, experimentation, and dissemination activities related to specific areas of knowledge: a National Institute of the Arts and Humanities, a National Institute of Learning, a National Institute of School Administration, and a National Institute of Language Arts are examples of possible approaches. Each institute would maintain a staff of interdisciplinary research and teaching specialists who would work with colleges, universities, state education agencies, local school systems and other appropriate agencies to develop new knowledge and new applications of knowledge in specific areas of concern.

These are our more important plans for program growth and development for the immediate future, and we obviously have high hopes. But we will continue dreaming for the time has come for bold, new steps in the improvement of education, and such steps will not come about without some positive approach to articulation between research and practice. We ask you to join us in this enterprise. Perhaps tomorrow's path to educational improvement will no longer resemble Alice's path to the top of the hill:

> "I should see the garden far better," said Alice to herself, "if I could get to the top of that hill: and here is a path that leads straight to it--at least no, it doesn't do that--but I suppose it will at last. But how curiously it twists! It's more like a corkscrew than a path!"

Summary

In summary, then, I have suggested that the federal concern for education and for research is a long and well established one, but any such concern for research in education is of much more recent vintage. As a result, educational research has suffered from four major handicaps: (1) a shortage of competent investigators, (2) a low level of financial support, (3) a notorious time lag in the translation of research findings into operating programs, and (4) the long isolation of educational researchers from their colleagues in the behavioral and social sciences and the reluctance to consider the more significant problems in American education as researchable.

The Cooperative Research Program of the U.S. Office of Education was established by the Congress in an attempt to overcome these handicaps and has proceeded on a project-by-project basis to provide significant new research leads and a growth environment for the training of educational researchers and the involvement of social and behavioral scientists in research related to education. Now we are proposing to move to a programmatic base as a means of fostering articulation between research and practice by bringing all sectors of the educational community into a common alliance for educational excellence. Such a relationship for progress is not beyond the capabilities of researchers and educators or the promise of educational research if only we can learn to work together and will set our minds resolutely to the task ahead.

RESEARCH IMPERATIVES IDENTIFIED BY THE CONFERENCE AT CARNEGIE INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

Erwin R. Steinberg

It seems to me that the most obvious imperative stemming from the Carnegie Tech conference--if there can be degrees of obviousness among imperatives--is that research on the teaching of English must be undertaken as soon as possible. The next most obvious imperative is that professors of English must be involved in such research.

In support of both imperatives, I offer what may not seem at first to be a very good reason, but what is certainly a sufficient one: if we don't, someone else will. As you saw from the proceedings of the conference we held at Carnegie Tech last May, there are hundreds of questions about the teaching of literature, language, and composition on which we need some good evidence. It seems reasonably clear that in the next few years Congress will supply funds in increasingly large amounts--perhaps in the millions of dollars--for people to seek answers to those questions. If we in English do not apply for the funds, one can hardly expect the United States Office of Education to deny them to others who do.

I do not mean to suggest that members of allied or different disciplines are eagerly awaiting our refusal of research funds so that they may have the money all to themselves. On the contrary, the conferees in Pittsburgh from all the disciplines felt strongly that the needed research would have to be carried out jointly--frequently in teams--by people in English, English education, education, and psychology. And the people from the other disciplines were quite modest about what they could contribute and quite insistent about the need for our participation and even leadership. I do mean, however, that if we fail to take part we can not expect the others to do the same. The research will be undertaken. We have the choice of whether it will have the advantage of our participation and direction or whether it will proceed without us.

There are other important implications to these first two imperatives. Recognizing that we are not adequately prepared for the research which we must nevertheless undertake, we must take care that the generations which follow us are not similarly handicapped. That is probably the third imperative.

The only way to insure the necessary competence is to provide training for it in our graduate schools. I am not suggesting that all or even most of our Ph.D. candidates be required to take seminars in experimental design or do theses on how best to teach English comedies of manners to school children of Spanish-speaking parents. (Nor, by the way, would I deprecate such undertakings for a certain number of graduate students.) I do commend to you, however, the recommendation of the college group at the Carnegie conference that there be:

> a Ph.D. in the teaching of English to be awarded by departments of English rather than schools of education. Such a degree would include a minimum number of education courses and a thesis on some problem in the teaching of English. (p. 98)

Surely if we trained these people in literature, language, and composition, they would carry our knowledge and philosophy into research they undertook on the teaching of English. They should also prove to be willing and competent partners with us in many such research projects.

The first three imperatives, then, suggest that alternatives for the future are not the bare choices of doing all of the research ourselves or refusing to do any of it. We can do some of it ourselves, either by ourselves or with others; and we can train some of our profession to do most of the rest of it. Furthermore, we can do whatever research is necessary without too much drain on either our time or our manpower. For if we train the kind of Ph.D. recommended by the college group at the Carnegie conference, we should attract many additional, highly competent, literate people to our ranks.

I should also warn that some of our Ph.D. candidates in the future will have to go farther afield than "a minimum number of education courses." Some of them, for example, will have to become competent in the use of the computer. Social scientists on my campus are already using computers to generate sentences from Chomskyan "kernels." And they have served notice that they intend to program computers to write the plots of novels.

When Norman Rice, the dean of Carnegie College of Fine Arts, heard that one of our social scientists intended to program a computer to write music, he responded quickly, "Then he'll have to program a computer to listen to it." I admire Dean Rice's wit and share his concern. But, really, whether or not a computer turns out a masterpiece of music or literature is irrelevant. In programming the machines and analyzing the results, the investigators are now learning many things about the cognitive processes and the laws of learning. I suspect, too, that they are learning things about composition that we do not know. And they will soon learn many things about how to teach language and perhaps even how to write. If scholars of English and linguistics are part of such research teams, we can count on the adequate representation in that research of our knowledge and our philosophy, and we will have available to us quickly the fruits of the research. If we do not participate, we may impede the research or allow it to follow profitless directions. It is just conceivable, too, that the research will succeed despite our failure to participate and that we will be left, like the Dodo bird, to a generation or so of flapping awkwardly over empty nests before we become extinct; or even worse, that we will be enabled to reproduce ourselves in small numbers in carefully arranged sanctuaries by some Audubon Society of the academic world bent on assuring that quaint academic disciplines do not disappear completely.

Once the three imperatives I have listed have been recognized and accepted, the rest follows logically. Our profession must then begin the research laid out in the papers and in the concluding twenty pages of the proceedings of the conference held last May at Carnegie Institute of Technology, a copy of which each of you has. I need not belabor the point, I'm sure, that the only way that will happen will be if department heads and deans reward such research the way they reward research in Gower or Faulkner, in prosody or in immediate constituents. It is unfair to ask members of the profession to undertake research that will not enhance their professional reputation. Furthermore, asking them to do so under such circumstances would probably be a waste of time, for few of them would agree.

Part IV of the proceedings of the conference, the Conclusion, indicates that by frequency of mention the conferees assigned a certain order of priority to the various items of needed research. Most pressing, seemingly, is research on the teaching of effective use of language. Next is the matter of the structure and sequence of subjects and courses: the best times, for example, to introduce various concepts of language, literature, and composition; and the levels at which one could reasonably expect students to perform certain tasks. Third is the relation of what is taught in the school to the subculture from which the student comes. (For a start on this last problem, I would recommend to you Margaret Mead's paper on "Cultural Bases for Understanding Literature" in the April 1953 issue of PMLA [pp. 13-23]. Because it is scholarly, literate, and provocative, it suggests that if we choose the right social scientists they can help us immeasurably in the problems that we have gathered here to discuss.)

The order of priority established by the Carnegie Tech conference need not, I would think, be regarded as a "research imperative." A more profitable--and reasonable--imperative is that the best place for many of us to start is on smaller and less important matters that lend themselves easily to research by single individuals or small teams of individuals and that can be done in relatively short periods of time. As we gain experience and knowledge from such studies, we may find the larger and more complex ones less difficult to attack. I was much impressed at our conference by the continued warning of one of the psychologists, a man of considerable experience in research in teaching and of becoming modesty, for all of his accomplishments. He kept urging us to "think small." At the beginning, at least, I think we ought to heed his advice.

I would suggest as another imperative a review of the literature and an examination of the effectiveness and of the implications of the research already done. This imperative was implicit in all of the discussions at our conference. Most of us professed ourselves ignorant of what research had already been undertaken, and about some of the studies we had read or heard we felt uneasy.

What should we make, for example, of the repeated findings of research studies that there seems to be little relationship between a student's knowledge of the patterns of the English language, grammar if you will, and his ability to use them adequately or effectively in writing? Such findings seem to run counter to the intuition, and, perhaps, the experience of a significant number of the members of our profession. Did the people doing the studies ask the right questions? Were their measures valid? Or are we, to resume my bird metaphor of a few minutes ago, acting like ostriches?

Fortunately, an important part of the review I am recommending is already well under way. Richard Braddock of the University of Iowa, with the aid of a committee of the National Council of Teachers of English on the State of Knowledge About Composition and with financial support from Project English, is preparing a report which will summarize and analyze the most significant studies on the teaching of composition. With such a report in hand we will be able to judge what the psychologists call "the current state of the art" and see much more clearly what studies ought to be undertaken next.

Similar reviews ought to be made of the research already done on the teaching of language and literature. Perhaps Project English support would be available for one or both.

Another imperative that is clear from the conference is that college professors of English must concern themselves not only with research in the college teaching of English, but also in the teaching of English at the elementary and secondary levels. You may have noticed that the elementary and secondary groups at the Carnegie Tech conference were as concerned as the college group about such matters as the possible relationship between the teaching of some form of grammar, whether traditional, structural, or generative, and the teaching of composition; or how best to teach effective use of language. Certainly professors of English and linguistics are needed in such research at all levels if it is to be effective. Elementary school people would probably not undertake such research by themselves any more than we would undertake such research at their level without involving them.

An important by-product of such research involving college professors of English and public school teachers of English at the elementary and secondary level is that in the process both groups profit. The school teachers extend their knowledge of literary and linguistic subject matter and techniques; and the college professors learn about the problems of teaching in the public schools, about which they tend to be quite ignorant. Each group also appreciates the other better at the end of such a joint project.

Quite frankly, I am convinced that instruction in English at the elementary and secondary levels will not improve unless college professors and public school teachers do undertake such joint projects. As long as we damn the work of public school teachers or treat them disdainfully, we will not have any sort of communication with them. Experience at Carnegie Tech and elsewhere has shown, on the other hand, that they are eager to have our help in improving the instruction that they offer and that our help is quite effective. For example, because of the work done by members of Carnegie Tech's English and history departments with Pittsburgh secondary school teachers, students of Taylor Allerdice High School in Pittsburgh last year did unusually well on the Advanced Placement American History exam. Their scores placed Taylor Allerdice as one of the three top high schools and prep schools in the country of all the schools whose students took that examination.

I might also add that unless we are prepared to help in the way that I have indicated, we had better stop criticizing. (I would classify that statement, by the way, as an imperative--but not one necessarily stemming from the Carnegie Tech conference. It is a personal statement. We ought to recognize that we here are responsible for a good bit of whatever ineffectiveness there is in public school teaching: we trained the teachers, we refused to help them after they graduated [unless they paid us homage by swelling the enrollment in our graduate courses], and we stood by while the public allowed school administrators to give them five or even six classes a day of 35 and 40 students each.)

Still another research imperative that comes from the conference is that we must be prepared to put to the test some of our own cherished beliefs. Many of us believe, for example, that effective teaching can best be carried on in classes no larger than 20 or 25. I do. But we really have no evidence to support this belief. And there is enough evidence to the contrary to raise doubts about the matter.

The same may be said about the value of individual conferences for students of composition. I personally believe they are very valuable. But are they? And if they are, where does the law of diminishing returns set in? My practice when teaching composition has been to require a minimum of one conference for each student each semester, two conferences for a good many, and three or even four for a few. One of my colleagues, however, requires a minimum of two a semester for every student, and another seems to require three or four. Thus, where I give about 25 or 30 hours per section per semester to such conferences, the latter of the two colleagues I spoke of must give 50. Certainly there is an inequity here, and certainly, too, we ought to be able to get some clear evidence on this matter with proper research.

In summary, then, the imperatives that I urge upon us all are these: that research in the teaching of English be undertaken promptly; that professors of English see this research as one of their major responsibilities and involve themselves in it in significant numbers (and, as a corollary, that heads of departments of English recognize such research in the same way they recognize research in literary studies or linguistics); that as a profession we insure that succeeding generations are better equipped to undertake such research than we are by enabling adequate numbers of them to prepare for it in graduate school; that we not accept necessarily the order of priority set up by the Carnegie conference as an imperative but rather that many of us seek simpler studies with which to begin, that we review what research has already been undertaken in the teaching of English as one of our first steps; that we concern ourselves with research in the teaching of English at all levels; and that we be prepared to submit for verification some of our closely held beliefs. Beyond these, I refer you to the bounty of research studies suggested in the proceedings of the May conference.

In closing I must confess to a dilemma that I faced in this presentation. I could not offer a mere summary of the proceedings of our May conference, which you had in hand in enough time to read, or a catalogue of needed research. I could only, then, offer my interpretation of the proceedings of the Carnegie conference and attempt to communicate some of the sense of importance I feel about various aspects of needed research on the teaching of English. If in the process I presumed, or sounded like a would-be Isaiah urging the fallen to earn "new heavens and a new earth," I must confess myself no seer and certainly no Old Testament prophet. I have neither the wisdom nor the stomach nor the hair for such a role. I do, however, feel very strongly about the profession's responsibility in this matter. And I feel equally strongly that you are the people who must win the profession over to agreeing that these are indeed imperatives and not simply optatives or indicatives. For simple wishing or stating will not cause to be done what must be done. As the word imperative suggests, responsible members of the profession must at least request and perhaps, on occasion, even command in order to insure the necessary action. Since heads of departments accepted the function of leadership when they accepted their positions, I can think of no more competent audience on which to urge research imperatives than this one.

THE PRESENT STATUS OF RESEARCH IN THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH

Geo. Winchester Stone, Jr.

I am aware that this conference was called for the purpose of exploring ways in which college and university departments of English can engage in effective cooperative research on the "teaching of English," and that my assignment is to speak briefly on the present status of such research. I shall probably, however, seem to you to default by appearing more in the role of devil's advocate at this particular point of our history, with reference to increased "research in the teaching of English." My hope is to provoke discussion and a hard look into our purposes and present needs. The subject as given seems to me to be barren, and although the money is available, the need, the desperate need for improving teaching of English, seems to me to lie elsewhere. But be patient and hear me out.

On Thursday 2 February 1769 the proprietors of the Little Theatre in the Haymarket in London, while we on this side of the Atlantic were brooding over the Stamp Act and taxation without representation, put on "An Attic Evening's Entertainment." The play notices in the Public Advertiser for the evening described this novel affair as composed of "Readings from Milton, William Mason's dramatic poem Caractacus, and Gray's Elegy, all done by the actor Thomas Sheridan, to which were added two pieces of prose composition of interest to both sexes; Dryden's Ode on the Power of Music; and pieces of vocal and instrumental music."

This assemblage of pieces was not in itself strange, and it must have proved interesting to the age of Benjamin Franklin, William Pitt and George III. But the purpose of the entertainment, and the cause to which the profits were dedicated are pertinent to our meeting this evening, for, the advertisement continued, "the profits arising will be applied to a Fund for opening an Academy the purpose of which will be the teaching of the English language grammatically, and the art of writing and speaking by rule. There have been stoves kept constantly burning for days past in order that the theatre might be thoroughly warmed [a note of the seriousness of the dedication]. Curtains will also be put up in the boxes [to reduce the drafts]. To begin at 7 p.m. Playhouse prices. By the Desire of Many."

So here we sit repeating the old, old story--for there in 1769 the three elements of "English as English" were recognized and spelled out--literature (Milton, Mason, Gray, Dryden), language, "teaching the English language grammatically" and composition, "the art of writing and speaking by rule."

And England then was facing (on a minor scale to be sure) a problem that faces us on a major one. It might be summed up in the broadest terms as an approach to democratic education. That benefit performance was not for a college at Oxford or Cambridge, or for one of the private preparatory schools--but for an academy in London, for those of all ages, who amid an increasing reading public, and an increasing writing public wished to perform with some standard of precision, understanding, and style. Worth noting is the integration of literature (contemporary), language and composition--the suggestion that they belonged together. Also worth noting is the absence of emphasis upon utilitarianism. The structure of the language, the art of writing, and the exemplification of it in passages well read from good writers of imaginative literature provided the come-on.

The academy was to teach by precept and example. But we needn't belabor this 18th century fragment to make the point that since then literature has flourished, magnificent writing has occurred, and the language in structure and in vocabulary, always fluid, has refused to be codified or be put into a straight-jacket of rules, much as the schoolmarms of academia then and now would like to have done so and would like to do so. Our language is the most living accomplishment we possess, because it outlives us all, as it has outlived our ancestors--"Not marble nor the gilded monuments of princes, etc. shall outlast it."

And the effective writers--those who have made words wield the matter, catch the imagination, touch the heart, open the mind, and persuade the intellect have not come upon their mastery of language as the result of "research projects"--(Burke, Wordsworth, Hawthorne, Macaulay, Lincoln, Wilson, Hemingway or Winston Churchill). One dare not in this company, I suppose, and in this age when "research" is in the saddle riding mankind, protest the trend, strange as he may deem it to be, but I have already declared myself out of step with the universe on this matter. I wonder first what the outcomes will be of the "research" now in progress under Project English, and how they will contribute to the goal of the improved teaching of "English as English" to millions of students in this country, according to our democratic principles of education which, I for one, believe to be basically sound. You may know the titles, you may not, but a listing of a few of them helps define my topic, "The Present Status of Research in the Teaching of English":

> The role of sequential dependencies in the child's acquisition of language, i.e. the measurement of the amount and usefulness of redundancy in the language written and spoken by children or to children in the fourth and sixth grades ($60,000)
>
> The application of descriptive linguistics to the teaching of English and a statistically-measured comparison of the relative effectiveness of the linguistically oriented and traditional methods of instruction ($49,000)
>
> The experimental development of the set of variability in rate of reading to develop the habit or "set" or varying reading speed in relation to the purpose of reading and kind of material being read ($50,000)
>
> An investigation of silent speech during silent reading. After obtaining electromycrographic and auditory measures of silent speech (subvocalization) during silent reading, the investigator will attempt to determine the relationship between silent speech and chronological age, reading level age, and intelligence, and to study the varying difficulty of reading material on silent speech ($7,000).

One must be fair and admit that brief titles, however clotted with polysyllables, seldom do justice to fully "designed" research projects. Doubtless the purposes are made clear, and the relevance to the problems that face the English profession are discovered as one reads through the whole presentation of each research project. But many of the titles as listed in the Project English Newsletter suggest themselves as proper addenda to the Third Book of Gulliver's Travels.

I take it you have all received the series of English Memoranda (now numbering 3) put out by John Fisher, which view the situation of research in the teaching of English and the financial support for it with a sense of the obligation that lies upon us all to do something about it. I assume you have all received information, via the Project English Newsletter, of the cooperative research program obligated by the USOE in July, August, and September 1962. You have heard Francis Ianni this afternoon on the subject of what

Cooperative Research can do for English. The motive behind Mr. McMurrin's desire to open up the Cooperative Research program as an aid to the improved teaching of English in this country is laudable, and we must all be duly grateful to him and his staff for providing the opportunity to seek funds in support of useful research.

Permit me, however, to react further to the obligated contracts during the first quarter of fiscal 1963. According to the information I have, fifty-seven projects have been approved in all eligible fields of education, obligating over a period of the next three or four years a grand total of $3,957,882. Of these fifty-seven projects we are concerned possibly with only eight which may be described as falling in the area of our interest, English. These are funded at $881,962 or 22% of the total of $3 million.

I have read you some of the titles, which baffled me. Let me point out the rest, in order further to define my topic:

1. Out of class programmed instruction compared with conventional assignment in teaching freshman English ($33,000)

(Is this a close look at independent study, under the new name and a carefully devised step-by-step procedure implied in the fashionable term "programmed instruction"?)

What may we look forward to as a result? There's nothing sacred or standard about old time assignments in freshman English, so presumably we will discover that careful preparation of materials, ladled out in doses that students of varying capabilities can take, can be taken by those students, that they can be tested upon their accomplishments at varying check points, and that "programmed instruction" is a possibility for others to try. So what else is new? This is methodology pure and simple and guaranteed to work both with the slow and with the fast groups. The more basic question is what is the nature of the freshman course? What does it assume in terms of literary and linguistic sophistication on the part of entering students? Should one course be programmed or several? Will it free the instructor to work with the bright students, or labor with the dullards? On the surface the project seems not to get at fundamentals.

2. Preparation and evaluation of curricular materials and guides for English language study in grades 7-12 ($243,000)

(Such preparation certainly is needed. This has possibilities.)

3. Development of reading materials and language materials grades 7-9 in depressed urban areas ($250,000)

Question: Until the profession comes to some agreement as to what the norm of an excellent "English as English" curriculum is, how profitable is it to devise materials which presumably differ from that?

4. Comparison of two methods of teaching remedial English to college freshmen ($11,000)

Would this not seem to be dead-end research, or experimentation? With the development of articulated English programs all remedial English on the college level should be abandoned. So a comparison of present methods seems rather temporary.

5. The effect of the knowledge of generative grammar upon the growth of language complexity ($31,000)

The effect of whose knowledge of generative grammar upon what growth of language complexity? The title as it stands seems to me to be so vague and unstructured as to be meaningless. Doubtless a fault arising from the necessity to compress infinite riches in a little room. Or is this merely speculation on the permutations and combinations possible with transforms?

6. Evaluation of five methods of teaching spelling in grades 2 and 3 ($13,500)

Probably has some practical uses.

7. A sequential curriculum in language, reading, and composition (oral and written) grades 7-12 ($250,000)

Here is briefest description. As far as status is concerned all projects are just getting under way. Presumably the profession will have annual reports of progress. I take heart, I suppose, in the general activity evidenced here, and I recall, as we all do, that pleasant essay by Abraham Flexner on the "Usefulness of Useless Knowledge."

In addition to these projects emanating from the USOE, I am aware of a particularly promising one now making the rounds of the foundations in search of support which has to do with the preparation of significant reading materials for elementary school children. Much has been written about this in the press, as a result of Ruth Strickland's book The Language of Elementary School Children. The proposal is for a cooperative development of materials. It is based upon a long-time study which negates former "research" into the ability of young minds to make much out of good reading materials. The cooperation here would be NCTE, MLA, and Indiana University.

In addition are promising articulated curriculum-development studies and practices going on in Pittsburgh, Terre Haute, Ann Arbor, and the follow-up workings of twenty Commissions on English Institutes. These last are spotted at Cornell, Duke, Harvard, Indiana, NYU, Ohio State, Penn State, Rutgers, St. Louis, Southern Illinois, Stanford, State University of New York at Albany, Tulane, Universities of California, Michigan, Nevada, Pittsburgh, Texas, Washington and Wisconsin, under the auspices of the College Entrance Examination Board. They are cooperative ventures between picked secondary-school teachers of English and the directors of last summer's institutes to try to forge integrated curricula in Language, Literature and Composition for secondary-school students who are college-bound. To be viewed with considerable interest, when it finally gets published, is Albert Kitzhaber's report for the Carnegie Corporation of a two-year study of freshman writing at Dartmouth College. I have quoted some key excerpts from this in the CEP notes in the front matter of the forthcoming December issue of PMLA.

Also in progress across the border in Ontario, is an experiment genuinely cooperative in nature, and explained in a very interesting report entitled Design for Learning. The report is from the Joint Committee of the Toronto Board of Education, edited by Northrop Frye, Principal of Victoria College of the University of Toronto. He has drawn together the reports of the English, Social Science and Science Committees in a most valuable and stimulating Introduction.

By the nature of my report so far, you will see the bent of my prejudice. Mr. Steinberg has talked well about the excellent report of the Conference held last May at Carnegie Tech on "Needed Research in the Teaching of English." I have read that carefully, especially the work papers by the English set, and am glad to see evidence of such openmindedness as appears there--if indeed the asking of questions indicates such a state of mind. The work papers express the points of view of five authors in

104 paragraphs which consist largely of the firing of ninety-one questions at the reader. And the reader has been bombarded with questions of similar import ever since 1959 when the report on Basic Issues in the Teaching of English appeared and flooded the country. There, you will remember, the thirty-five basic issues were couched in terms of thirty-five questions and were reinforced by 97 more as each issue was elaborated. And we can continue to hurl into the sybil cave of destiny, as Carlyle would say, question upon question, and whenever two or three English professors are gathered together the questions start being asked. And education will never stagnate as long as they keep being asked. But at some point we must get on with the subject and move from interrogatives to action--action that demands mastery of English by its teachers!

The fallacy that we seem to have got ourselves entangled with, so far, in research in the teaching of English, I would think, is the quantitative fallacy: more research will give us the facts upon which to base more experiments, upon which to make a massive attack upon present inadequacies in the teaching of English as English. And the research in almost every instance, as I read the projects, is based upon the same quantitative statistical approaches and methods which produced the earlier research in the teaching of English, which we have now found to be wanting. The words and syntactical constructions of pre-school children, and those in grades 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, were listened to years ago, and on the basis of that statistical count graded readers were constructed, barren in content, but driving hard on the so-called basic laws of learning--recency, frequency, and intensity.

And now a whole new world of aural communication bombards the children aged one to ten, so we design another experiment, happily called "research," using the same approach, and find the vocabulary different from what it was twenty years ago. Will this lead to the use of literary masterpieces (hopefully) or will we develop a whole new set of readers--child centered in terms of the child's real levels of speech habits, from which nobody profits but the printers and booksellers? We match up two batches of random samples, one batch for experiment, another for control, and deem in a year or two's time we have discovered something new and vital in terms of the optimum age at which to introduce students to the vocabulary of critical terminology, or the concept of irony. We probably haven't done any such thing, as another matched group five years later under different conditions, will, by the same process of nose counting, disprove.

I noted with interest the work papers of several psychologists in the Carnegie Tech conference which tossed in so many ifs, ands, buts, and conditions, in such experimental designs, and pointed out the multiple dangers of too soon concluding from sets of apparently simple evidence, as to make one rather skeptical of the usefulness of this sort of approach to research at all in the teaching of English.

Even those breeders of the statistical approach, the mathematicians, are wary, and ask a dozen questions: How reliable are the answers to the questions asked? Are negatives in a sampling technique sufficiently few in number to justify acceptance of the positive? What reliable inferences can profitably be drawn from the mass of conflicting data assembled? Are the multiple variables in the *sources* of information in the behavioral sciences capable of accurate control in a sufficient degree to make applicable and useful the techniques of scientific experimental method?

Curricular development falls into a different category. It always needs experimenting with, and its most fruitful direction at present seems to be the attention now being given the three elements of English (literature, language and composition--two knowledges and a skill), and a sense of their cumulative, sequential, articulated development over a long span of the school years.

The *Basic Issues Conference* in 1958 not only asked 132 questions but made concrete suggestions as to what might profitably be done to weld together an articulated curriculum in language, literature and composition in answer to them. Its *An Articulated English Program: a Hypothesis to Test* (1959) was not a bad start, and merits further cooperative work, since it was designed to produce just the sort of cooperative activity upon which the survival of English depends. The MLA *Issues, Problems and Approaches in the Teaching of English* (Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961) includes the *Basic Issues* reports plus thirteen other essays of enduring power which every English teacher should be topside of. The Commission on English of The College Entrance Examination Board will issue a three-volume report in 1963 resulting from three years of planning and activity in teacher training and curriculum building for the college-bound. Happily it will state a position concerning the teaching of English on several levels of sophistication, will present a volume of possible curricula, and a second volume of sample kinds of tests.

But the two most currently exciting booklets in the field, doubtless, are Jerome Bruner's The Process of Education (1961), which says some very important things (many of them more evidently useful for science and the social sciences than for English) and which bids fair in one year's time to become the new gospel for schools of education throughout the land, and Northrop Frye's Design for Learning (the Toronto report, about which I spoke above).

The essence of Mr. Bruner's thesis, as far as we are concerned, lies in his comments upon basic structures in various subject matter fields, the development of a spiral curriculum, and the encouragement of hunches, intuitive thinking. "If earlier learning," says he, "is to render later learning easier it must do so by providing a general picture in terms of which the relations between things encountered earlier and later are made as clear as possible." So the question for our research, or experimentation, or pondering in general, would appear to be how to teach fundamental structure in literature, language, and composition effectively and to provide learning conditions to foster this. Secondly, he notes, "The foundations of any subject may be taught to anybody at any age in some form." And further, "The basic ideas that give form to life and literature are as simple as they are powerful. To be in command of these ideas, to use them effectively requires a continual depending of one's understanding of them that comes from learning to use them in progressively complex forms. . . . A curriculum as it develops should revisit these basic ideas repeatedly, building upon them until the student has grasped the full formal apparatus that goes with them." This seems to be his "spiral curriculum." In the third place, Mr. Bruner requests an honest presentation of literature, with emphasis upon the intuitive grasp of ideas, not a presentation based upon formalized equations and elaborated verbal concepts. "The nature of intuition," remarks he, "requires the development of an intellectual technique of arriving at plausible but tentative formulations without going through the analytic steps by which such formulations would be found to be valid or invalid conclusions." This sort of fertile hypothesis leads to productive thinking and has been neglected in the schools.

Well enough. What is the basic structure of English as English, or what are the basic structures which will have relevancies of wider import and deeper dimension the more they are revisited in more complex works as the student goes up the ladder of age and schooling? Mr. Frye's Committee seems to have used Mr. Bruner's book constantly, so he stops asking questions and makes a few tentative proposals, and implies others which may be paraphrased briefly:

1. Metaphor is basic, from the language of everyday speech to that of the most rarefied poetry.

2. Syntax (in expository communication) has in English an accepted structure, which the history of the written record shows to have been relative, not absolute. The changes in language morphologically and syntactically are facts of its structure important for every student to know. The language has long received attempts at codification into grammars based upon assembling the major patterns and a listing of the exceptions. Of late concentration is being leveled at the exceptions and the new growths, until we now have what might be called sprung grammar (traditional, descriptive, generative, to name but three). The basic point is the relativity of the basic structure of the language--relative to time, appropriate level of usage, etc.

3. In Literary Fiction four basic modes exist: tragedy, comedy, romance, and irony. Of these comedy and romance are primary and can be introduced to the youngest children. Tragedy and irony are more sophisticated.

This is but a start, but these basic elements we, so called professionals, in the field of English, deal with constantly. Is there anything here that needs to be researched in connection with the teaching of English? Or is there, rather, much here that needs to be mastered in terms of specific pieces of literature?

With what forces are we working all along the line in schooling? Frye suggests that in all learning two forces are constantly at work, a radical pioneering one and a conservative supporting one--a learning that explores and one that consolidates. In the primary phase (early schooling) says he, the conservative consolidating force is memory and children have good ones. How are we harnessing this power and directing it? In the primary stage the pioneering force has to do with the reasonable and systematic--this is the new and different and educative. This is the cutting edge. How are we encouraging and utilizing this?

In the secondary phase (Secondary Schooling) the pioneering and consolidating forces blend in interest in the conceptual. The student is not content to be a passive listener. He asks *cui bono*? He asks about relationships between what he reads and other ideas, behavior, habits. There are realities and appearances. So the problem of symbolism enters. The leap from the particular to the concept occurs in all fields of education, but is particularly pertinent in literature.

Now all this may be true, and all is provocative, and one thinks how magnificently Lowes, and Kittredge, and Auerbach, and De Quincey have spoken on these very subjects. And one thinks with a sense of great concern of the report of the NCTE, The National Interest and the Teaching of English, that from 40% to 60% of the teachers of English in this country are inadequately prepared as they stand before their classes to teach English as English, and one wonders whether what we need, at this point, is the expenditure of another million dollars on "research on the teaching of English," or whether we do not more urgently need to have the funds made available, as I understand they can be by law, for conferences, and seminars, and in-service training programs to enable teachers to become masters of the structure of English, in its three components.

It is the teacher who must be aware of the basic structure and who must be sophisticated enough to know how subtly and gradually to make this apparent to the pupil through the literature, through the study of the language, and through the student's writing. It cannot be done apart from the literature, the language, and the composition. The basic factors in the sonnet are its brevity, compactness, yet sense of fullness; its binders in a rhyme scheme and a rhythm to yield a sense of flow; its structural use of subordinate clauses to gain the cumulative effect of climax; all combining with the imagery to produce an indelible effect absolutely incapable of achievement by the expression of the underlying ideas in a passage of expository prose of comparable or nearly comparable length. That convention has determined upon 14 lines, and several variant patterns of rhyme scheme is of minor interest, and for teachers to dwell upon this as some do as central in describing the form is to reduce poetry to statistics. The essential factor in all drama is that it is the art of concentration--concentration forced upon it by the physical limitations of the stage, and the physiological span of attention of the audience--a text, acted upon stage, to produce a calculated effect upon an audience. The Epic and the Novel share the privilege of being the arts of amplification, with time on their hands to describe, to develop, and fill in, and interrelate. How does a structure in these forms vary because of the limitations, or freedoms, or purposes which dominate them? But simply to ask this and to say the above and leave it at that is to sterilize all life from the art of the Play, the Epic, and the Novel.

John Diekhoff, taking his cue from Bruner, has asked in his work paper for the Carnegie Tech Conference "How can we devise a curriculum which will better communicate the structure and principles rather than the mere particulars of our discipline?" We cannot and we should not. Our discipline is the particulars. Tragedy is nothing apart from the play, with its total aesthetic effect deriving from the particulars of plot, character, sentiment, dialogue, and setting. And the novel is nothing apart from the people that walk in it, what they say and do, as selected and organized by the author. And the poem is nothing apart from the tone which is created from the particulars. The curriculum, in English, methinks, should not be developed to communicate structures and principles. The curriculum should be planned to furnish the mind of the pupil with the particulars, exciting, interesting, challenging, disrupting, eye-opening, both from the past and the present. The teacher, master of these particulars--as 60% seemingly are not--must lead the way from the precept to the concept, from Oedipus and Macbeth to a concept of tragedy, from Black Beauty, Lassie, or some current and touching animal story (or perhaps "Michael"), and Hamlet to the difference between the sentimental and the tragic.

I should like to see Project English funds go in greater quantity to universities and colleges whose faculties are willing to work with municipal or state school systems in a series of seminars and in-service conferences which would spread the benefits of a summer institute throughout the year, and which would meet weekly to discuss a shaft of learning in literature, language and composition extending from elementary school through the second year of college. The teacher's mastery of the subject English seems to me to be first in the list of priorities for a long time to come.

2

RESEARCH IN COMPOSITION

Harold C. Martin

Somewhere Andre Gidé remarks, in the vein of Ecclesiastes, that everything has been said already, and then adds that fortunately human memory is short. Perhaps that is a new meaning for the expression "of blessed memory." At any rate, the remarks I shall be able to make on the subject assigned to me will pretend to no novelty: at best, they may refresh memory and provide some start for discussion.

The topic invites three questions. (1) What kinds of research in English composition are feasible? (2) What kinds have been done, and with what results? (3) What kinds remain to be done, and with what likelihood of valuable yield? I shall deal with the second first, going from the known to the unknown and the nebulous, a choice that is largely a strategem. "If the Sun and Moon should doubt,/ They'd immediately go out," Blake says, and I must defer my exit for long enough so that the chairman will be able to remember that I was here and did speak even if he can't remember my having said anything.

If it is possible for someone to have substantial command of the research so far done in composition, I do not lay claim to it. My colleague, John Carroll, speaks glumly of such research after years spent in reading and analysis. A document prepared by Richard Braddock, of Iowa, does not give me ground for feeling any cheerier than Carroll does. It is entitled "Synopses of Certain Selected Studies in Composition" and, though incomplete at the moment, attempts to summarize the soundest research projects in the past three decades. In the preliminary report the six summarized, of a likely twenty, deal with effect of class size, rate of word flow, reliability of grading, effect on writing skill of varied frequency of assignment, effect on reader reliability of using single or multiple topics, and comparative success of freshman composition classes taught by three methods (traditional small class with instructor; assigned reading on principles of composition and class performance with apparently little or no discussion of general principles; mass instruction by kinescope followed by discussion of principles and performances, in regular class groups).

From examination of all the pertinent dissertations in the Teachers College series, some dozen or so out of more than nine hundred, and that dozen generously construed to make room for one on generalization versus drill, using arithmetic, and one on rationalized versus intuited method, using material from the study of United States history; from three pertinent studies in Harvard Studies on Education; and from other scattered sources, I add these research topics: grading scales, articulation, individual versus group instruction, effect on compositional achievement of permitting students to choose their own topics, listing of topics declared most interesting by pupils, listing and ranking of compositional items discerned by teacher-readers.

The papers read at last Spring's Conference at Carnegie Institute supply additional subjects: constituent-element analysis of writing samples, oral versus written exercise, relationship of writing to independent reading, upgraded versus graded programs of instruction, relationship of explicit purpose to quality of written expression. Repeated and continuing research studies by the Educational Testing Service deal with effect of lay readers and graders, self-correcting home-work, inventories of common errors, programmed exercises in vocabulary, reliability of judgments of writing ability.

Obviously, this summary does not canvass the field, yet I think it representative. If it is, serious problems are immediately apparent. This is a conference not of people from schools of education but of senior members of English departments in schools of liberal arts. Concerned as they may be about improving their own freshman compositional courses and eager as they may be to assist schools in improving their English curricula, it is beyond the stretch of imagination to expect them to continue most of the kinds of studies I have mentioned. This is not to say that those studies are useless. Triviality of problem or even of outcome may be more apparent than real. If, for example, it could be definitively shown that more students learn more quickly to write better when met once every two weeks in private consultation than when met three times a week in a class of twenty; if it could be definitively shown that no one can form a valid judgment of a student's compositional ability on the basis of a single piece of writing; if it could be definitively shown that more students write better if required to write once a term than if required to write once a week; if any of these hypotheses could be demonstrated beyond cavil or reasonable doubt, then we might make confidently some adjustments in our machinery that we can now make only with trepidation. Now, as a matter of fact, there actually are good research studies to support proposition two, studies more carefully made and more austerely evaluated than any but one or two of those I listed at the outset. Why, then, have they had little effect on practice? The answer, I think, is very simple. We have scant faith in any such studies, perhaps doubt the possibility of substantial research in composition altogether, and incline to believe that whatever improvement is possible will come from improvement of the species rather than from innovations in therapy.

At the Carnegie Institute Conference, Garlie Forehand, of Chicago, suggested a line of research for improving measurement, based on a simple distinction between what occurs in a paper and the value of what occurs; and he hinted at another, turning on the basis for those choices which we call "style" after they are made. Both his suggestions and his warnings, warnings supplemented by W. J. McKeachie, of Michigan, seem to me more pertinent to our discussion than any of the studies I have referred to so far, and more pertinent, as well, in my opinion, than any of the eight recommendations reported by Erwin Steinberg in his succinct account of committee discussion and decision at the Carnegie meeting (College English, 2, November, 1962, p. 150). I do not mean to disparage the recommendations, for they represent certainly very serious undertakings. Yet I cannot help feeling that every one of the five that is presented as a "research" project (numbers 3 through 7) will so successfully resist the empirical procedures implicit in them that the results will be as unpersuasive as the results of all past studies to which we pay little or no attention.

The problem of feasibility, it seems to me, can be faced from two positions. If what we mean by "research" in composition is the sort of empirical study that attempts to relate altered conditions or stimuli to general compositional achievement, I think we are doomed to sterile activity, no matter who does the work, if for no other reason, because satisfactory controls are impossible. It is sometimes possible, I understand, to make up for instability by volume, but I suppose that volume must have some relationship to the diversity of variants, and I do not see how, even in what is called a "longitudinal study," it is possible to get volume enough to make variants unintrusive. If we could isolate the compositional act in time and space; if we could insulate the subject from extraneous stimuli; and if we could then introduce single new factors experimentally, record the consequences, and interpret what we recorded, we would have something reliable. But, at the same time, we would not have anything to rely on, simply because the research conditions would so thoroughly have contravened normal conditions as to render the findings irrelevant unless some a priori proposition about the relationship of the real to the ideal were introduced. There are, I am sure, some testable matters for which sufficiently stringent controls can be established to render stable and indicative results, but I see nothing to make me think that those matters bear sharply enough on our main business to warrant great expenditure of time, money, energy, and professional concern, none of which is ever in very long supply.

One of the most interesting, though surely not the best disciplined studies I have encountered, is called An Analytical Study of the Qualities of Style and Rhetoric in English Composition (E. M. Hinton, Teachers College series No. 806, 1940). It submitted several pairs of themes to a large number of experienced teachers, recorded their comments in nominal form, and construed an order of emphasis in rating. There is nothing at all unusual in the items themselves, and the grouping imposed on them is equally conventional: elements, principles, and qualities. The order of emphasis, however, does hold some interest. From most frequent to least, these are the matters emphasized: substance (most), mass, coherence, words, sentences, unity (last). The tentative inference from the study, I quote: "Possibly the best way to improve the quality along the entire front would be to help writers learn more facts, to understand better what they learn, to select information for specific purposes, and to arrange the material in the most effective order possible for the purposes at hand" (p. 115). What I call your attention to is this: ignoring for the moment the fact that this is a study with minimal controls, operating on several unstated premises, note that it deals not with the conditions surrounding the compositional act but with the materials of that act. Perhaps it is from this position, and variations on it, that we can more profitably discuss the feasibility of research. This particular study seems to me flagrantly indifferent to questions one might raise about its premises (it assumes that readers' comments indicate criteria of quality, that frequency of comment equals degree of importance, that subjectivity translates directly into objectivity, and that the most effective way to fill a void is to pour something directly into it); how many of these premises are sound, I cannot say, but the number of them and the fact that all are tacit make me uneasy about the security of the conclusion. Even so, I think there is something more solid here than in the more thoroughly empirical studies I have examined.

The question is whether feasible studies, based on the substance rather than the conditions of compositional teaching and writing, can be sufficiently disciplined to encourage respect. From the point of view of manageability, they are certainly feasible, even for departments and persons without generous subsidy. From the point of view of freedom from unwarranted assumption, feasibility is admittedly less certain. If this, they will not, of course, be any more suspect than the grounds on which we now make most of our decisions about these matters, and that is a slight reassurance, but with care we might be able to do even better than that.

We might--and here I turn to my third question, about kinds of research still possible to us--make some profitable inquiries by converting some of our commonest assumptions into hypotheses and devising brief, tight tests of their validity. For instance, let us hypothesize that students who use intensive adverbs and adjectives very freely also incline to organize loosely (by which I mean badly, my premise, of course). Observation over a period of a few weeks ought to give us warrant for making such a hypothesis sound or unsound. If sound, it would be worth while to find out whether pointedly repressing these students' use of intensives would affect looseness of organization and how; or whether direct and intensive training in organization would result in decrease or increase in frequency of intensives. Another instance: hypothesize that the frequency of purely supportive adverbs and adjectives (certainly, undoubtedly, definitely, and the like) varies inversely with the frequency of dependent clauses. If observations bear out the hypothesis, watch the effect on sentence structure when such words are specifically forbidden. One thing every teacher of composition learns is that, even among his most intelligent students, he finds few whose written syntax is flexible enough to provide ready alternatives relevant to demands of meaning. What would be the result, then, of taking a cue from Benjamin Franklin and deliberately teaching imitation of style, of eight or ten distinctive styles, let us say? And what the effect of teaching the same thing by parody rather than by direct imitation? If this seems too gross, what could be made of exercises in construction shift, for the same purpose: one part of a sentence altered in such a way as to require syntactic or verbal alteration elsewhere (e.g., Ebony, unlike most woods, is so heavy that it does not float. Change so heavy to too heavy. Or this: Amateur sky watchers observe such things as constellations, aurorae, meteors, variable stars, eclipses, comets--a sky eternally full of wonders waiting to be seen. Initiate this sentence by the word For.

These construction-shift examples are taken from some testing experiments of the College Entrance Examination Board Committee of Examiners in English, with which some of you may have been associated at one time or another. That committee could easily supply a solid account of the persisting and prevalent faults in students' writing (an account that each college would need to modify for its own population, of course), and it has been for years engaged in devising ways of getting test candidates to show their full goodness and badness in brief compass. Its concern is with testing rather than instruction, of course, but the two are intimately related, and there is some evidence that its cleverest or, at any rate, most amusing tests may be more useful for teaching than they ever proved to be for testing (the construction-shift noted above, the hole-in-the paragraph, the bad-metaphor test, paragraph organization tests, something we called "trigger exercises" in which data were supplied which students had to incorporate into a series of connected sentences, or in which no data were supplied but requirements were set--"In three connected sentences describe four characteristics of a good novel, automobile, orange, dog"). Members of the committee know from experience that the diabolically subtle "interlinear" test devised by Professor William Sale, long a staple of the examination, is useful both during and at the end of instruction.

All of these sound narrow, I know, but all of them bear directly on what we are trying to do in composition; and all of them invite careful study. Does any of us know how to help the student who writes without an ounce of detachment to develop some? It is a matter of living, of course, and recalls to my mind a perturbed freshman who brought me a paper he had just had returned from a lecture course, on which the instructor had written "immature." The student proved the accuracy of the comment by his question to me, "How do you get mature?" As English teachers, we might have more than one answer to that question, as we might to the problem of detachment; as teachers of composition, we may be able to do more than we think, not by counseling but by leading the student to work purposefully with language in the faith that what he does with words will turn out to be something he has done to his mind. But we cannot help him as much as we would like unless we can have more assurance than we now have that there are some procedures that do work better than others. The number of such simple studies possible is surely great, and nothing is needed for them but human ingenuity and some general conviction that simple observations amassed from scores of studies might provide reasonably fruitful working procedures, especially for apprentice teachers.

Essentially, what I am suggesting here is research into the stylistics of composition. I know, of course, that in the eyes of many, stylistics has aborted as a fundamental literary study. I do not share that opinion, even though I grant that a full book on the inversion of subject in Proust weighs heavily on the conscience of any advocate. But, regardless of its yield in literary study, I would argue that it may be the only really feasible, productive, and palatable kind of research we can expect college English teachers to undertake as a sideline, which is what this kind of study will have to be for most of us. Unless we do engage in such activity--call it "research" if you like--we shall continue to parrot the common-sense rules of Quiller-Couch, or Strunk and White, or Orwell's "Politics and the English Language," or of Ezra Pound's A B C of Reading. These may carry us along from day to day, but they all smack of arbitrariness, though of different kinds, as much as of good judgment, and we cannot regard them as much more than placebos and spring tonic--good enough for what ails you if nothing much does, but useless for anemia of reference and schlerosis of syntactic structure. I am inclined to believe, moreover, that compositional ailments seldom come singly: they tend to form syndromes and to remain unaffected by piecemeal treatment, but to dissolve in concert if the syndrome is attacked. The student who habitually extends conclusions beyond evidence may or may not be reachable through logic; if this habit is regularly accompanied by identifiable disorders, or even characteristics, of diction or syntax, it is possible that an attack through them may succeed where an attack through argument does not. Only systematic investigation can give us assurance on that score, and systematic investigation is what we lack.

Whatever this approach may offer, it guarantees nothing remotely like certainty. The only claims I can make for it I have already suggested. It is the kind of approach college teachers can take without feeling they involve themselves in technical complexities beyond their grasp. Whatever it yields is not only directly relevant to the teaching of composition but immediately applicable, without the intervention of administrative apparatus. And, since it deals in the substance of the subject itself, it has an intrinsic interest for the teacher and should repay him not only in effectiveness, if successful, but in increased understanding of language and literature, whether successful or not.

This is far from all that can be done, I am sure. With liberal help from psychologists and psychometricians, college English teachers can develop long-range studies about composition that may yield much more than these simple home-made ones. To cite one possibility: Jacobsen's studies of verbal aberration are provocative, but what they may mean for normal behavior is not yet known. Concerted effort to use the pathological for insight into the ordinary would take time, money, and refined technique, but it might be productive in some parts of compositional work, as it is, for example, in plant culture. Another: extensive studies in the order of learning processes directly related to writing (are there any that are not?) might do something to still, or justify, the fervid calls for system that issue under the name "articulation." For such projects English teachers in liberal arts colleges--and professional writers, too--might well act as advisers (a variation on the second proposal made by the Carnegie Institute committee), though I suspect that in the main such continuing studies must fall to the lot of English specialists in schools of education. The particular service liberal arts people might perform is that of keeping such continuing studies oriented toward semantic, linguistic, syntactic, and structural concerns rather than toward what the psychologists at Carnegie called "global projects" involving imponderables like motivation, interest, condition, and the like--not that they are unimportant, only that they are unmanageable.

Then, in their own bailiwick, college teachers might advisedly begin to carry out, in groups large and small, the kind of narrow and assiduous investigations I have suggested above. Forty-five years ago E. L. Thorndike, grandfather of most of the schematic empirical research in education since World War I, said in what is now often referred to as a "classic definition" of reading: "reading . . . involves the same sort of organization and analytic action of ideas as occur in thinking of supposedly higher sorts." Without attempting a classic definition of writing, I would submit that writing involves the same thing, that reading and writing and thinking are fundamentally alike. That is only to say with Blake that we see not with but through the eyes. Mind--whatever that is--lies behind all three, as it does behind other human activity "of supposedly higher sorts." The further we allow our research to get away from the immediate symptoms of mind, the less likely we are to turn up anything meaningful. Every increase in scope and in duration will necessitate expansion of machinery and every expansion of machinery requires more numerous and more subtle technicians to keep it from converting sand crystals into ten-cent ash trays.

We claim to be humanists, and need not consent to be anything else. At the same time, we all have constantly to be on guard lest we equate genteelism or despair or plain laziness with practice of the humanities. We will not put ourselves out for hire even if federal gold beckons; on the other hand, we want to avoid being turned out to pasture if we can. A decent circumspection will undoubtedly mark any pedagogical research undertaken by college English departments like those represented here: asked to submit requisitions for equipment, most of us feel daring and really quite advanced if we ask for a slide-projector or a photographic duplicator. We are in little danger, I think, of being overwhelmed by machines. The mistake we are more likely to make is in confusing the siren call of publicizable "research projects" for the voice of duty whispering low--and, dutiful people that we are, in lending our energies to experiments that have no genuine promise for our work and that will, almost certainly, produce in us more revulsion than revolution after the novelty has worn off. These are times in which we all need wax in our ears, but they are also times in which we must fight to survive; and, happily, they are times in which there is fair prospect that we may be able to survive, and have coin of the realm to help us, if we will do even a little to help ourselves.

RESEARCH IN THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LINGUISTICS
(A SUMMARY)

Albert H. Marckwardt

With respect to discussions of the pedagogy of English language and linguistics courses, as they are taught in college, we begin with what is very nearly a vacuum. I know of no discussions in print on these topics. This is in sharp contrast, for example, to the teaching of composition, where the aims and procedures of the freshman English course have been subjected to agonizing soul searching for years. I have encountered at least conversational exchanges on how best to conduct a seminar in a literary period, but no one has ever questioned me on my technique in handling the great vowel shift or on how I deal with zero allomorphs in a course in morphemics.

Unfortunately, moreover, teachers of English language and linguistics do not generally enjoy a reputation for pedagogical virtuosity. They are often typed as the crochety and eccentric members of our English faculties. This is all the more reason for some careful attention to what makes for success in the teaching of language and linguistics at the college level. It could have important implications for English throughout the entire curriculum.

College courses in language and linguistics run the gamut from courses in the earliest stage of English to the language of the present day. They include the historical survey. They may go so far as to use English only as a point of departure for a course that is really an introduction to or a presentation of general linguistics. Yet, to use the vocabulary of the educational researcher, the population with which we are dealing in many of these courses is fairly limited. Hence, a full-dress research design, with control groups, careful matching, test instruments checked and rechecked for reliability and validity are not always feasible. Consequently, I am inclined to believe that we must concern ourselves with exploration rather than controlled experimentation, at least as an initial step.

In thinking about our pedagogical problem, I have asked myself just what it is that we are trying to teach in our college language and linguistics courses. The answer, I believe, is a five-fold one: skills, techniques, a body of knowledge, a series of concepts, a set of attitudes.

(a) Teaching a student to get meaning from a printed page of Old English is essentially a skill development process.

(b) Teaching a student to parse a sentence, whether it be done according to Kittredge and Farley's grammar, the immediate constituent analysis of the structural linguist, or by means of the transformation of kernel sentences, is training him in a technique. So is instructing him in how to use a dictionary intelligently.

(c) The facts about the loss of inflections during the eleventh and twelfth centuries and the processes which account for it are part of a body of knowledge, as is the impact of Italian loan-words on the English language of the Remaissance.

(d) The morphophonemics of the noun plural inflection and the phonetic symmetry reflected therein is an illustration of the concept of patterning in language. So, too, would be the ordering of a series of adjectives modifying a noun. This is more than just fact--it reflects a view of language as patterned human behavior.

(e) With respect to developing attitudes toward language, our purposes are at least three in number: instilling a sense of responsibility to language, a degree of linguistic sophistication, and a sense of historicity.

It is to be observed that as we move from the skills aspect of our aims through levels of complexity to matters of pattern concept and attitude, we encounter things that are progressively more difficult to test, and hence more difficult to fit into a conventional educational research design. Let me reiterate my belief that at this particular time, controlled experimentation is less important than the kind of empirical exploration that will focus upon some of the pedagogical issues. I shall mention just a few:

1) How can just the sheer skill of reading and comprehending Old English be taught most effectively? The old method was to attempt to predigest the grammar and then to read extensively. Then came textbooks which presented the subject in a fashion much like that of the conventional elementary foreign-language grammar. What else might be tried? Possibly oral drill of the type that Waldo Sweet uses in teaching Latin. Or perhaps programmed instruction adapted to the teaching machine.

2) How useful would it be to replace the conventional grammatical analysis of Old or Middle English with one that is structurally oriented? The possible advantage would be a presentation that was simpler and more consistent. The disadvantage might be a divorce from the conventional presentational pattern of the other Germanic languages.

3) Is there a plateau which develops in the speed and ability with which students can read Old English poetry? How may it best be overcome?

4) What is the minimum about Middle English which the student needs to know in order to be able to read Chaucer with satisfactory accuracy? Is this best taught systematically or incidentally?

5) Is a course in the structure of Modern English best taught by adhering to a single type of analysis? What is the best way to steer between the Scylla of closed-mindedness and the Charybdis of confusion?

6) Is a course in the structure of Modern English best taught by beginning with the phonology and proceeding in turn to inflections and syntax, or is it better to begin with syntax?

7) Is the historical course most effectively taught by beginning with Old English and moving forward in time, or by beginning with Modern English and moving backward, proceeding from the known to the unknown?

8) Can the history of the English language be reinterpreted in terms of present-day structural concepts, and how may one go about it?

9) What is the place of induction and class exercises of a laboratory nature in language and linguistics courses?

10) Are medieval literature and the history of the English language of that period best taught together or separately?

By no means all of the most pertinent issues have been suggested, but those which have been listed are illustrative of what we need to know. They are not yet focused with sufficient clarity, nor have they been thought about with sufficient ingenuity to permit our designing formal research projects at this time. We are still at what might be called a developmental phase. What we most need at present are experimentally minded teachers, ingenious instructors who will think about these matters, dream up solutions and try them out. Only then will we be ready to proceed to an experimentally more rigorous program.

RESEARCH IN THE TEACHING OF READING AND LITERATURE: WHAT COLLEGE ENGLISH DEPARTMENTS CAN DO

J. N. Hook

The question to which my remarks are addressed is: What can English departments do by way of research in the teaching of reading and literature? In attempting to answer that question I shall regard as irrelevant any consideration of whether the kinds of research I shall mention may or may not be supportable by the federal government or by foundations.

My first answer is that significant research of the kinds now going on in English departments has its own special contributions to make in teaching. I need not labor for you the argument that such research at least potentially makes the professors and their graduate students better teachers; if it does not have that happy result, it certainly makes them better-informed teachers, though perhaps in a severely limited area. Neither need I labor for you the argument that scholarly research and criticism affect the content and sometimes the structure of undergraduate and graduate courses in English and occasionally influence instruction in the secondary schools. As one example from the past, Professor Lowes' Road to Xanadu has had its direct or indirect impact upon virtually every high school or college course in which Coleridge is considered. As a more recent example, Professor Johnson's definitive edition of the poetry of Emily Dickinson has made it possible for students for the first time to get at what the poet actually wrote, minus beclouding emendations by intermediate hands. The point is that any literary scholarship worthy of the name, if it deals with authors and selections taught in the schools and colleges or with background for those authors and selections, may influence what goes on in some of the nation's classrooms. Its results may be small: a more accurate reading of one line of King Lear; in between: a clearer understanding of Melville's conception of the nature of evil; or large: a new perception of the similarities and the differences between the Neo-Classicists and the Romantics.

I am saying, then, that research of the kinds traditional among us merits continued encouragement and applause and material rewards, partly because it contributes to better teaching.

But side-by-side with such research topics, and deserving of no less encouragement and applause and material rewards, are subjects of kinds that too few literary scholars have yet become much interested in.

In 1958, in Contemporary Literary Scholarship, Professor Lewis Leary said:

> Just as there is no longer reason for invidious distinction between the scholar and the critic, so there is also no reason to distinguish between the scholar-critic and the teacher. He who is one is to some large but varying degree the other. Whether the classroom-audience is made up of readers of a coterie magazine, graduates in seminars, or a group of tenth-graders, the task is the same: to communicate something which he knows and about which he is enthusiastic to an audience which does not know or properly appreciate. The enterprise is trifurcate: to discover as scholar, to analyze as critic, and to communicate as teacher. No one of these activities is effective without the qualifying support of each of the other two.

Scholarship in English, as in other subjects, is primarily a study of relationships. For a number of years the relationships investigated tended to be between an author's life and his work, an author and his predecessors or contemporaries, an author and his intellectual milieu, or the works of one author and those of another. Under the influence of the "New Critics," the emphasis shifted to a study of the relationships among the parts of a literary work; the explicators, for example, analyze minutely the structure of a poem to see what contribution to the whole is made by each image, sentence, clause, phrase, or word.

One type of relationship, however, has been but little studied. This is the relationship between literature and the readers or potential readers of that literature. Some phases of that vast topic have been dipped into. To cite a few examples: In 1914 H. F. Dilworth studied reading tastes as influenced by college admission requirements. In 1915 Van Wyck Brooks, in America's Coming of Age, surveyed changing literary tastes. William S. Gray and Ruth Monroe in 1929 analyzed the reading interests and habits of adults. Louis R. Wilson examined the geography of reading, and David Daiches, literature and society, both in 1938. Alice Hackett in 1945, Frank Luther Mott in 1947, and James D. Hart in 1950 surveyed the best sellers. Malcolm Cowley's The Literary Situation (1954) addressed itself to the interaction of book and reader. Several very popular books of the past dozen years have devoted some pages to the question of who reads what and why; among them are Riesman's The Lonely Crowd, Spectorsky's The Exurbanites, Mills' The Power Elite, Whyte's The Organization Man, and Packard's The Hidden Persuaders. Like a number of other writers such as Albert Harbage and Louis B. Wright, Richard Altick looked at past relationships between writer and reader in his book, published in 1957, called The English Common Reader: A Social History of the Mass Reading Public.

I believe that there is room for other studies that examine the interaction of books and readers. A few examples: Fred Eastman and Robert Downs have not exhausted the topic of books that have shaped the world. I should like to know more about the role of Upton Sinclair's The Jungle and Edwin Markham's "The Man with the Hoe" in the labor movement of this century. I should like to know whether high literary quality and a place on the best-seller lists are incompatible, and if so, why. I'd like an updated version of What People Want to Read About, written by Douglas Waples and Ralph Tyler in 1931. I wonder about why Sir Walter Scott and Lord Byron were fantastically successful in the early nineteenth century, and why today's intellectual climate would probably ignore their modern equivalents. And why are there only two or three American poets today who can make a comfortable living from poetry? What effect has television upon reading habits? Why within the past fifteen years have nonfiction books far outstripped fiction in popularity? These are general questions about the writer and his clientele. I should think that a literary scholar who is interested in what happens to books might well investigate such questions.

I come now to the kind of interaction between books and readers that I wish especially to focus upon in this paper. This is the interaction between literature and student, a topic about which we know desperately little. The reason is that we in departments of English have paid no more than casual attention to it. Although I could list forty or fifty books on literature and the general reader, I should be hard put to name five about literature and the person learning to read literature. Louise Rosenblatt's Literature as Exploration (1937) comes to mind, and George Norvell's The Reading Interests of Young People (1950), and, stretching a bit, G. B. Harrison's recent delightful but highly subjective book, Profession of English. Some "methods" books and textbooks might be suggested, but they are seldom solidly based upon research for the simple reason that adequate research does not exist.

A book is written to be read. Only if it is read can it have any effect. Those of us who love books, those of us who teach English, have as a major purpose in life the inducing of others to read. We want to help them find in literature the pleasures, the values, the enlightenment that we find in it. We are the producers, or at least the stimulators, of the next generation of readers. It has been said that Americans are not readers. I believe that the charge is exaggerated, since Americans do buy about a billion books a year, but to the extent that it is true, we who teach English have failed. What have we done that is wrong? What have we not done that we should have?

Howard Mumford Jones, recalling the University of North Carolina as it was more than thirty years ago, wrote: "The Carolina undergraduate of the twenties was characteristically book-shy. A book was something you studied for a teacher, and its proper dwelling-place was a mysterious building called the library where you went when you had to." I fear that yet today too many undergraduates and even some graduates are book-shy. Why have we failed to induce in young people a voracious appetite for the revelations of the printed page? I should like studies of the reasons for our failures and for our successes, wherever we have succeeded. I should like experiments with course content and with course organization to discover what produces readers and what does not. If we have on our faculties some teachers whose students become especially enthusiastic about literature, I should like to find out what they do and what they are. If some of our colleges and universities produce secondary school teachers who are especially proficient in teaching literature, can we identify those colleges and find what there is in their programs that brings such results? If some colleges do a better job than others in courses for the non-majors (who may constitute 90 to 95 per cent of the enrollment in our freshman-sophomore English classes), can we find those colleges and analyze what they do?

Those are representative of the kinds of questions to which we have inadequate answers and to which answers can be supplied mainly by departments of English. To answer them we need research in the teaching of literature, a different breed of cat from research in literature, though still a study of relationships. When we do research in the teaching of literature, we are basically concerned with the interaction of literature and student and with the catalytic function of the teacher. The same high standards of objectivity to which we have accustomed ourselves in literary research must apply here, and much of what we have learned about principles of research is applicable. But since we are now considering students, and not literature alone, we introduce the need for a measuring stick to which we have previously paid little attention: we need to measure the effects of our instruction upon students, and to compare as accurately as we can the results of various patterns of course organization, content, teaching procedures, and literary emphasis.

To be more specific, I shall describe a generous baker's dozen of studies that need to be made, generally in more than one place, with the results compared and verified or refuted.

1. As teachers of English, we teach reading. We say we teach literature, because that sounds more dignified, but actually we are trying to teach students to read better than they did before they came to us. Edgar Dale illustrates the point this way in the October, 1962, Newsletter:

> In Dostoevsky's novel The Brothers Karamazov, Father Zossima asks: "What is hell?" and answers, ". . . it is the suffering of being unable to love." A fifth grader can pronounce these words, recognize them perceptually, but can he read them? He can't get the meaning of this passage because he is conceptually immature. The mature reader brings not only his personal experience to bear on the interpretation of this passage but he also brings his past reading experience. He can ask himself whether Becky Sharp, Madame Bovary, Huck Finn, or Falstaff had the capacity to love other people. He compares, judges, evaluates.

We assume that we know how to teach students to read in such a mature fashion. But do we know, honestly, how successful or unsuccessful we are? Have we ever measured our results by any standard other than our highly individualistic tests and examinations? Are any other standards possible? Have we experimented with and tested a number of contrasting approaches to reading improvement? Do we know how to use profitably the varied backgrounds and preparation--literary and otherwise--that our students bring to our classes? We guess, guess, guess; we muddle through; we get some obviously good results. But what do we really know about the development of mature reading skills? How many students capable of profiting from the right kind of instruction fail to get it?

2. In departments of English we use little factual evidence in making decisions about our course offerings. That may or may not be objectionable on the upper undergraduate and the graduate levels, where we obviously should offer courses in line with the particular strengths of our faculty. But on the freshman and sophomore levels we tend to determine our course offerings on the basis of intuition, personal preference, or national fads. At one time, for instance, survey courses were de rigueur; then we became vaguely dissatisfied with them and replaced them with courses in masterpieces, or courses in genres or authors, or courses in close reading, or courses in specific centuries, or something else. But so far as I know we have never examined in any objective way what kinds of freshman-sophomore courses are best for inducing a love

of reading and for providing a working knowledge of the concepts and terms most useful in discussing literature. Neither have we examined objectively the question of whether English majors need the same freshman-sophomore courses as the non-majors need. How much literary analysis should we teach when? What values exist in the biographical, the sociological, and the historical approaches? Does any combination of approaches lead to best results?

3. This is somewhat similar to 2. In "An Articulated English Program," prepared by G. W. Stone and others as a supplement to the report of the Basic Issues Conferences, this statement appears:

> Literature for the college freshman and sophomore should survey the English and American tradition, and examine the literary effectiveness of certain ideas of convention and revolt as expressed in differing periods, and among differing forms. . . . At this level teachers should be concerned with (a) intensifying the students' interest and their desire to form good standards of judgment; (b) improving their reading skill by demanding more perception and sensitivity; (c) helping them to understand certain of the masterpieces in the English-American literary tradition; and (d) giving them some sense of the continuity of this tradition.

Those two sentences suggest a multiplicity of research topics. Is a course organization possible, within the few hours available to most students in freshman-sophomore literature, that will encompass historical survey, masterpieces, and treatment of the same themes in different periods, and also teach students how to read better and to intensify their interests? If it is possible, how can it best be implemented? Why is surveying important, or is it? Why emphasize the tracing of ideas across the centuries? If not all of the Stone proposals can be incorporated in one brief program, which may be sacrificed with smallest loss?

4. In these days of booming enrollments, we need additional controlled studies to show the effect of various class sizes upon students' learning. What, for example, are the measurable benefits of small class size which permits vigorous discussion and frequent teacher-student conferences? Administrators and boards of trustees must strive constantly for economy of operation. Can we offer them documentary evidence that small classes produce significantly more favorable results? Is any kind of teaching of literature as effective in groups of one hundred or several hundred as in groups of twenty or twenty-five? If we can demonstrate that discussion in

small groups brings best results, what kinds of discussion are most profitable? On all our faculties, I assume, we have some instructors whose students emerge from the classroom still discussing, students who debate literary questions heatedly even in their dormitories; and we have other instructors whose students "take English" and there's an end to it. What are the qualities of excitingly worthwhile literary discussion? How can we help some instructors to improve their hours devoted to classroom discussion?

5. Related to class size is the question of audio-visual materials, or "gadgetry" as some would prefer to call them. Here we include educational television, films and filmstrips, recordings, tape recorders, literary maps, overhead projectors, and teaching machines. To what extent is it feasible to mechanize the teaching of literature? Is there a point of diminishing returns in the use of audio-visual aids? If so, where? Are they more suitable for teaching some things than others? John Ashmead of Haverford College has told me of a successful experiment in teaching metrics through machine programming. What else can be taught in this way? What is lost in mechanization? What is gained? Some degree of mechanization, whether we like it or not, will probably be forced upon us. What is to go into the programs for teaching machines, to choose a single example? Who will build the programs? What is the best sequence for mastering literary concepts? How may those concepts best be taught through programmed instruction? We have an opportunity here to make a contribution to instruction not only on the college level but on the elementary and secondary levels as well. If we in English departments do not share in preparing what goes into the machines, we shall be unhappy with what comes out of them.

6. Is it possible to arrive at a consensus concerning qualities to look for in a text? We observe, for example, Gulliver's Travels, presented in three different ways. In one text it is merely printed, with no introduction, no biographical note, no footnotes, no editorial paraphernalia whatsoever. In another text are a brief biography of Swift, a short historical and critical introduction, and enough footnotes to clarify eighteenth-century terms that might be obscure to a twentieth-century undergraduate. In a third the biography is longer, literary criticism of the book is presented in considerable detail, footnotes are abundant, and discussion questions and topics for student investigation are listed. Which of the three kinds of texts is most suitable for the use of college students, or should all three kinds be permanently available so that the instructor may choose in light of his own strengths, weaknesses, and purposes? Research is needed to show relative gains attainable

with each type of text. Research is needed also to show what characteristics besides accuracy are desirable in a text in order to make the strongest impression upon students. What kinds of introductions, notes, illustrations, and questions--if any or all of these are needed--are most helpful?

7. The problem of literature in translation is a vexing one. Even though our students may know one or two foreign languages well, much of the riches of foreign literature is available to them only in translated works. How and when should literature in translation be presented? In an elective or required freshman-sophomore course? In a course for upperclassmen? In a genre course? In a course that traces ideas through the ages and around the world? Quality of translations varies greatly. Would it be feasible for a group of English teachers, working cooperatively with specialists in the various languages, to prepare a bibliography of translations which would evaluate the strong and weak points of each?

8. We have hardly scratched the surface of the relations of literature and linguistics. What does scientific study of the language have to offer to the study of literature? What, for example, can linguistics contribute to an analysis of style? Why are some writers "hard," others "easy," when their basic ideas may be essentially the same? What linguistic devices (phrased in modern terms) does Alexander Pope employ in his couplets? What contribution does the linguistic complexity of Faulkner make to the quality of his writing? May readers overlook the depth of Hemingway because of the simplicity of his sentences? What are the purposes and the effects of e. e. cummings' linguistic experimentation? How much, in teaching literature, should we analyze an author's linguistic techniques and idiosyncrasies? Where do we reach the point of diminishing returns in such teaching? At the University of Edinburgh linguists are at work on a general statement of the categories of modern English grammar for application to the analysis of literary texts. Outside the ivied halls, in a California company called General Precision, Inc., experiments have been conducted with a sentence-generator program which produces "poems." This program is also being used to investigate problems in stylistics and literary form. Upon request, the "Auto-Poet," as it is called, will prepare a "poem" with rhymes, metrical controls, and a "thought" or an "effect"; then it can turn its attention to an analysis of a poem by John Donne. I am not sure of what the moral of this is, though sometimes I worry about technological unemployment in our profession.

9. Also needing more study is the relation between writing and literature. This was phrased as follows in the report of the Basic Issues Conference:

> What is the relation between learning to write and reading of imaginative literature? Although good writers are usually discriminating and sensitive readers, not all good readers write well. Some courses, and even some college departments, separate composition and literature from each other. Does the ability to write well come largely from exercises which reflect the student's own practical needs? And does too great dependence upon literary models produce an affected or too imitative style in student writers? Conversely, how can a student ever acquire a sensitivity to language without studying literary works which illustrate such sensitiveness? Does the common course which includes both literature and composition tend to neglect one in favor of the other? If so, is this because we know too little of the relationship between them?

10. Teachers of English frequently complain that their students do not recognize classical and Biblical allusions. The problem of allusions is much more complicated than that, however. In our urban-centered, TV-centered civilization, students are ignorant of most of the past. The rural America of Whittier's "Snowbound," for example, or the rural Scotland of Robert Burns could be on another planet: Many students cannot picture a well-curb, with or without a Chinese roof; in a dozen lines of Whittier some students will not understand "nightly chores," "brought in the wood," "the mows," "the herd's grass," "whinnying," "stanchion," "walnut bows" on the cattle, and "the scaffold's pole of birch" where the rooster sits. The picture of family life of "The Cotter's Saturday Night" is beyond the comprehension of many youngsters from today's on-the-go families. Nor need we go back to an earlier century for examples of students' lack of awareness of the past; not only World War I or the Great Depression but even World War II is ancient history. I should like to see some research, perhaps in cooperation with history departments, in ways of developing a time sense, a better awareness of how our ancestors lived, an understanding of the influences that have made our superficial lives very different from lives of the past even though basic human nature has changed but little.

11. Of use to both college teachers and those in the lower schools would be an intensive study of levels of difficulty of literary selections, so that we could have more factual evidence upon which to base a sequential program. The readability-formula theorists have

done some work on this, but even their most elaborate word counts have serious weaknesses; for example, Tom Sawyer and Huckleberry Finn are equal in difficulty according to the Flesch formula, yet Professor Floyd Stovall calls Huckleberry Finn the most difficult novel written by an American. Professor Northrop Frye has made a basic analysis of the logical ordering of our subject, but his work needs to be greatly expanded and documented. Working with teachers of English on problems of sequence, which are clearly related to reading difficulty, should be psychologists who possibly can help to identify the levels of progression needed in teaching such things as figurative language, irony, tone, or ambiguity.

12. What are the best kinds of examinations in literature courses? In testing our students we always run the risk of killing the appreciation of literature that we have been so painstakingly developing. Can tests be devised that will enhance rather than decrease literary appreciation? What varieties of tests will teach while they measure? What is the role, if any, of objective tests?

13. In an integrated course, such as one labeled "American Studies" or "Humanities," how may the literary component best be treated? Are any differences in treatment implicit in such a course because of its inclusion of more than literature? How can accepted literary values be retained in that kind of course, and perhaps enhanced because of the non-literary content?

14. Until fairly recently, teachers of literature lived in a relatively narrow world of books and authors. Then Freudian and other psychology brought new insights into literary interpretation, which repaid the debt by supplying psychologists with some of their classic examples and even terms, such as "Oedipus complex." Now we realize that sociology, anthropology, history, the biological sciences, and even the physical sciences have implications for literary analysis and for the teaching of literature. Just how great these implications may be we do not know, because not enough work has yet been done. I should like to see a number of pieces of research that will analyze the significance to literature of studies in the impinging disciplines, with eventually, perhaps an attempt at synthesis by some twentieth-century Francis Bacon or Goethe willing to take all knowledge as his province.

15. Since tomorrow's high school and college teachers are in our literature classes, and since they will determine in large measure the literary backgrounds of the students who will be coming later to us in undergraduate and graduate courses, I believe we

should continue to study, as methodically as possible, ways to prepare those teachers. This is something we cannot leave to departments of education. They have their own strengths, but they do not have the detailed knowledge of subject matter that we have. Nor can we leave teacher preparation to the great god Hunch, or assume that the way we were trained is the best or the only right way. We should experiment methodically with different programs of preparations of teachers, and conduct follow-up studies to see which bring the best results. We should continue to be concerned with what is the best preparation for graduate work in English, and experiment with that, but we should also be concerned with what is the best preparation for teaching. If William Riley Parker is right in his statement that from his graduate students, most of whom will become teachers, he cannot assume knowledge of "the simplest technical term or the simplest Bible story or myth" or piece of literature, it is an even more serious indictment of college English professors than it is of high school programs. The kind of research needed for preparing teachers is obviously quite different from literary research, but its value in the long run will be no less.

16. Finally, it is heartening to note in the pages of the _English Journal_ and some other magazines that respected literary critics are giving some of their attention to those literary selections widely taught in secondary schools--not just _The Scarlet Letter_ and _Silas Marner_ and _Macbeth_ but also _Johnny Tremain_ and _The Oxbow Incident_. The kind of enlightenment that these scholar-critics can provide helps a relatively uninformed secondary teacher to do a much better job. Some of you in this room have written articles of that sort. We need more of you. And we need more of you and more members of your departments to do something that is cooperation and leadership rather than research or criticism: to sit down with high school teachers and discuss with them, as fellow-toilers in the vineyard, which literary selections and concepts may be most useful in working toward their goals (remembering that not all their students are college-bound). Is _Julius Caesar_, for example, the best play for high school sophomores? What is a good sequence of Shakespearean plays for young students? Do colleges prefer that their entering students have behind them a chronological survey of American and English literature? If not, what is the best substitute? High school teachers cry for such help. They rightly do not want us to dictate, but they plead for our counsel.

I do not pretend that the numerous suggestions I have made for research in the teaching of literature are all-inclusive. No doubt any of you could considerably supplement the list. I hope that you will encourage interested members of your departments to devote some of their efforts to a kind of research that no one else can do so well and that for too long has been neglected.

RESEARCH DESIGN WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH

N. L. Gage

The chairman of an English department knows little about research design. When I get through with this paper, he will still know little. Nor do I believe he should know much.

Then why am I here? Our assumption is that such chairmen need a basic literacy in research design. Possessing such literacy, they will have a better grasp of what must be done by themselves and by others in research on the teaching of English. An auto owner gets along more comfortably with a mechanic if he knows the difference between a carburetor and a transmission. The chairman of an English department should get along better with an educational psychologist if he knows the difference between a correlational study and an experiment. When I am finished, I hope you will know that difference and a number of others. I also intend to deal with the general nature of the proper collaboration between professors of English and educational psychologists, with some other central concepts in research design, and with the basic strategy of research and development in the teaching of English.

Proper Collaboration in Research

At the conference held last May at Carnegie Institute of Technology on needed research in the teaching of English (Steinberg, 1962), some of the statements anticipated some I had originally intended to make on my own. Because of their importance, these points bear some brief review.

Professor John S. Diekhoff, for example, speaking of professors of English, said that ". . . we are neither scientists nor statisticians and are not trained in the techniques of scientific experiments. And we are either too smug or too ignorant to call for the collaboration of colleagues in education and in psychology who do know these techniques and the principles that underlie them " (p.20). Perhaps the presence of several psychologists at the Carnegie conference would belie the present cogency of Professor Diekhoff's charge. But persons trained in the techniques of behavioral research should not merely appear at conferences of teachers of English. For the right kind of research to be done, educational research workers and psychologists need to work closely with professors of English over more substantial periods. So Professor Diekhoff's point is also my first point. Serious attempts to design, execute, interpret, and apply research on the teaching of

English cannot be carried out by professors of English alone or by educational psychologists alone. Mere lectures at conferences, occasional consultations, or calling in evaluation experts after a curriculum change has been developed--none of these will suffice. Nothing less than intimate collaboration from start to finish is essential.

Two psychologists at the Carnegie meeting made similar statements. Garlie Forehand discussed a number of important aspects of research that I shall also deal with. But he concluded with the same point that Diekhoff had made: "Perhaps the most fruitful mode of interaction between psychologists and English educators lies in joint research . . ." (p. 50).

W. J. McKeachie, another psychologist at the Carnegie conference, after considering important aspects of design, also made the point I have already taken from Diekhoff and Forehand. He said that research "requires special know-how which one cannot pick up in a conference or by reading a book. If you're planning research, begin by getting help from specialists in research design . . ." (p. 55).

It may well be that this is the most important thing that I have to say to you today. Joining Diekhoff, Forehand, and McKeachie, I want to drive home the point that fruitful research and development in the teaching of English requires joint effort at all stages, from conception and planning to the final analysis and application, between specialists in English, on the one hand, and those in educational and psychological research on the other.

Basic Distinctions and Concepts in Research Design

Having belabored this dictum, let me point briefly to a series of distinctions bearing on my topic. To illustrate them, I shall refer to the problem that came up most often at the Carnegie conference (Steinberg, 1962, p. 105), namely, the problem of the relevance of grammar to the teaching of writing.

First, let me distinguish between rational and nonrational ways of knowing. Obviously, nonrational paths to truth, such as intuition, have no need for research design.

Within rational methods, one can distinguish between deductive and inductive methods. Deductive methods, proceeding by the rules of logic from premises to conclusions, also make no use of research design in the sense in which the term is usually used. Inductive methods, on the other hand, arrive at generalizations from observations of specific instances; educational and psychological research usually refers to such methods.

Within inductive methods, a distinction can be made between _correlational_ and _experimental_ methods. In correlational studies two or more variables are measured or observed as they occur under natural or uncontrived conditions, and the relationship between them is then ascertained. One variable might be scores on a test of knowledge of grammar obtained by a group of college freshmen; another variable might be the same students' scores on a test of skill in composition. Determining the coefficient of correlation between these two measures would constitute a correlational study.

In an experiment, on the other hand, one of the variables, the independent variable, is manipulated, and the values of another variable, the dependent variable, are measured concurrently or subsequently. Typically, a correlational study does not permit any inference as to a causal connection between the two variables involved, but an experiment does permit such an inference. In an experiment on grammar, one group of college freshmen might be given one kind of instruction in grammar, and another group might be given a different kind; subsequently, the skill in composition of the two groups would be measured. Here the kind of instruction in grammar is the independent variable, and the skill in composition is the dependent variable. If the experiment is properly designed, we could draw conclusions as to whether varying the kind of instruction in grammar causes differences in composition skill.

Problems Common to Correlational Studies and Experiments

Many problems of research design are common to both correlational studies and experiments. Thus the research worker must define and delimit his variables carefully. Just what is meant by knowledge of grammar? By composition skill? How is each of these measured? With what reliability and validity?

Problems of sampling also arise in similar forms in both correlational studies and experiments. About what population of students does one wish to generalize? All college freshmen? All freshmen in a given university? Or only the freshmen in the engineering school? How should the sample of these students be drawn so as to permit generalizations to the total population to be made with maximum justification? To obtain a representative sample, we often resort to random sampling, in one of its many forms. This process in turn presents its problems. How large should the samples of students be to permit us to draw inferences with the desired degree of confidence?

How sure do we want to be that we are not committing either of two kinds of error in inductive inference? An error of Type I occurs when we conclude that there is a difference between two groups of persons or a relationship greater than zero between two variables when in fact there is not. An error of Type II is made when we conclude that there is no difference or relationship when in fact one does exist.

The discipline called statistics is concerned with describing variables and relationships between variables and with inferring about populations from samples. Students in education and psychology learn methods of statistical description and methods of estimating the statistical significance of empirical results. No one expects the professor English to know statistical methods. But he should appreciate the essential role of statistical competence in empirical research on the teaching of English. The specialist in educational and psychological research can contribute this competence.

Correlational Studies

After the basic problems of measurement and sampling have been solved, correlational studies proceed in relatively straightforward fashion. One computes measures of relationship in the form of correlation coefficients or differences between averages of one kind or another. The hazard in such studies arises at the stage of interpretation. What is the meaning of whatever relationship between two variables may be found in such a study? Typically, if two variables, A and B, are found to be correlated, either A is partly causing B, or B is partly causing A, or what is often most likely, both A and B are being determined in part by a third variable, C. For example, if knowledge of grammar is positively correlated with skill in composition, we cannot conclude that the knowledge of grammar has determined the degree of composition skill. Nor can we infer that the composition skill has determined the degree of knowledge of grammar. We might be more justified in concluding that both of these variables were being determined in part by some other variables, such as general intelligence, or the cultural level of the students' home background, or the overall bookishness of the students' interests.

On many issues, only correlational studies can be carried out. Working with human beings and their educational experiences, we often cannot manipulate the variables about whose effects we are concerned. Such manipulation may be too costly, too difficult, or altogether impossible. We cannot manipulate a student's social class or IQ or skin color in the ways required by a true experiment; hence such variables can never be the independent or manipulated variables of a true experiment, as defined below. For this reason, despite the difficulties of drawing firm conclusions about what their results mean, correlational studies are here to stay.

Experiments

It is important to realize that, in a true experiment, the values of the independent variable, i.e., the treatments, are assigned to or imposed upon two or more groups of persons who are allocated to these treatments at random. In a true experiment, for example, grammar would be taught to one group of students or classes chosen at random from all students or classes under study. The students not taught grammar would also be selected at random for that treatment. The so-called experimental and control groups would thus be what is called randomly equivalent. Let me repeat that, without such randomization, we have no true experiment, but only a quasi-experiment. For this reason, no research on cigarette smoking in relation to cancer has thus far qualified as a true experiment. The cigarette smoking has not been applied to men selected so as to be randomly equivalent to nonsmokers; both the smokers and the nonsmokers have selected themselves. And we do not know what biases in heredity and environment have accompanied such self-selection. The results of correlational studies of cigarette smoking in relation to cancer have been interpreted as evidence of causal connections, and this interpretation does indeed seem plausible. But the causal interpretation will not be conclusive until a genuine experiment involving randomly equivalent groups can be carried out.

Experiments are made in order to make adequate tests of causal hypotheses. The design of experiments is a discipline in its own right. Men devote whole careers, books, symposia, courses, and laboratories to it. It is largely a formal discipline in the sense of being general over many types of content or substance. That is, the principles of experimental design apply in similar ways to many research areas--to agriculture, psychology, physiology, physics, and teaching--where variables can be manipulated and experiments can be made.

Some aspects of experimental design are somewhat unique to research on teaching, however, and I shall illustrate these briefly. We shall soon have a thorough treatment of these matters by Campbell and Stanley (1963).

Threats to the Validity of Experiments

To illustrate experimental designs, I shall describe first a poor, yet not ridiculous, design, and then an excellent one. In explaining what makes one design poor and the other one excellent, I shall touch upon threats to the validity of experiments and how the two designs succeed in warding off these threats.

First, consider the so-called one-group pretest-posttest design. You may know it as the before-and-after test. In this design, we would work with only one group of students. At the beginning and end of a course of instruction, we would measure their skill in composition. During the semester or year we would administer the experimental treatment, say instruction in formal grammar. The difference between students' average scores on the pretest and on the posttest of skill in composition would be interpreted as a measure of the effectiveness of the instruction in grammar.

A look at what is weak and vulnerable in this experiment tells much about the requirements of a good experimental design. What are the threats to its internal validity, or the degree to which we are justified in saying the difference was actually due to the experimental treatment and not to other factors? I shall use the terminology of Campbell and Stanley in describing these threats.

First, this experiment does not rule out the possibility that so-called "history," or specific events occurring between the first and second measurements, other than the instruction in grammar, may have produced the difference. Such other events may have been good criticism of writing in a concurrent history course, or the coming to town of a popular lecturer on writing, or the appearance of a series of articles on good writing in the local newspaper. Our weak experiment does not rule out the possibility that this kind of "history," rather than the instruction in grammar, made the students more skilled in composition at the end of the year.

A second threat to the validity of this experiment is "maturation," or the processes within the students occurring as a result of the passage of time in itself, such as growing more mature, increasing in mental age as well as chronological age, and the like. Our weak experiment does not rule out the possibility that maturation made the difference.

A third threat to the validity of this weak experiment may be called "testing," or the effects of taking the pretest on the scores obtained on the posttest. The initial test of skill in composition may have provided sufficient practice in writing, or other instructional influences, to produce a gain on the posttest even though the grammar teaching had no effect.

A fourth threat to validity is called "instrumentation," which refers to the changes in measures due to changes in the calibration of the measuring instrument. The posttest of composition skill may have yielded higher scores because it called for writing on an easier topic, or because it was graded more leniently.

Finally, skipping over some threats to validity called "statistical regression" and "differential selection," which would take us into technicalities, I shall mention what Campbell and Stanley call "experimental mortality," or differential loss of students. If the poorer students dropped out of school during the course of the year, the average score on the posttest might be higher than that on the pretest of composition skill solely because of such experimental mortality rather than the instruction in grammar.

To what extent could the results of this experiment be generalized to groups other than those involved in such an experiment? One threat to such generalizability, or external validity, is the "reactive or interaction effect of testing," such that a pretest might increase or decrease the students' sensitivity or responsiveness to the experimental variable. Such an effect would make the results obtained for a pretested population unrepresentative of those that would be obtained with students who had not been pretested. Our pretest in composition skill might thus have alerted the students to the importance of such skill and have made them undertake to improve it, and achieve a gain on the posttest, apart from any practice or instructional effect of testing or effect of the instruction in grammar.

Another factor that could affect the external validity of an experiment, or the degree to which its results could be generalized to persons who did not participate in the experiment, is the "reactive effect of the experimental arrangement." This term refers to the possibility that the effect of instruction in grammar as part of an experimental program might be different from its effect under routine, everyday conditions.

Now, how could these many threats to the internal and external validity of the experiment be warded off? Many different designs have been devised to thwart one or another of these threats, and Campbell and Stanley deal with a considerable number of them. For our purposes, it will suffice to look at what is called the pretest-posttest control group design. In this design, in addition to the group of students already mentioned, who took a pretest and a posttest with grammar instruction intervening, we have another group of students, randomly equivalent to the first. This group of students also takes the pretest and the posttest, at the same time as the experimental group, but it does not receive the instruction in grammar.

A moment's thought will reveal how the addition of this control group makes it possible to ward off the various threats I have just described. "History," or relevant intervening events other than the grammar instruction, is the same for both groups; hence any difference in their posttest scores cannot be attributed to "history" but only to the one variable in which they do not differ at random, namely, the instruction in grammar. Similarly, "maturation" cannot explain any difference in the posttest score between the two groups, because presumably both groups matured in the same way over the interval between the pretest and the posttest. The effect of "testing" cannot be given credit for the difference between the experimental and control groups, because both groups received the pretest. Similarly, "instrumentation," "mortality," and the other threats to internal validity can be ruled out as rival hypotheses in explaining any difference between experimental and control groups in the pretest-posttest control group design. (The two threats to external validity could be thwarted only by using a more complex design.)

This brief discussion merely skims the problems that good experimental design is intended to overcome. Campbell and Stanley describe three poor or so-called pre-experimental designs, three true experimental designs, and ten so-called quasi-experimental designs; the latter designs lack optimal control but are worth undertaking where the exigencies of the environment make better designs impossible.

As my examples may have indicated, much of what experimental design is concerned with appeals to plain common sense and can be understood on purely intuitive grounds. Most of the Campbell-Stanley chapter can be understood without knowledge of statistics.

A Word on Strategies

Although the principles are easy to understand, the amount of work required by research based on these principles often looks formidable. A considerable investment is required to carry out a decent experiment or quasi-experiment in the teaching of English. The most important part of such an experiment is the treatment, the experimental variable, the thing that is done to students. And, by virtue of my topic, I have had nothing to say about such treatments or course improvements or methods of teaching. Whether a big investment in an experiment is worthwhile depends on how much conviction we have as to the promise of the treatment we are investigating. What such treatments should be is not in my province. For example, it is not for me to say on this occasion whether it is still worth while to chase the bubble of formal grammar or whether all the research (DeBoer, 1959) that points to the futility of grammar should be regarded as having settled the issue. (Yet, let me say parenthetically that it seems worth while to make a fulldress review of the methodology and findings of those decades of research, in the light of present-day refinements in our understanding of research technique.)

But now let me raise the question of whether we must always do formal correlational studies and experiments or quasi-experiments. Or, on the other hand, is there room for the kind of informal cutting-and-trying that engineers and gadgeteers engage in? As I recall from my boyhood reading about Thomas Edison, he did a lot of such cutting-and-trying. Many filaments were tried, and not much seems to have been invested in any one, before it was discarded and another was tried.

Can research workers help teachers in developing the courses and teaching methods that might be worth subjecting to formal experiments? Some suggestions along these lines have begun to emerge from the experience of educational psychologists in working with course improvement programs. For example, Cronbach (1962) has upheld the value of teachers' opinions about pupil accomplishment in try-outs of new courses. If we accumulate such relatively inexpensive types of evidence rather than reject them outright, we lay a better basis for the more expensive kinds of systematic observation and testing of the effects of new content and methods. Similarly, he urges greater attention to performance on the individual items of tests as against total test scores. The latter average achievement over many questions and are much more difficult to interpret.

More flexible and adaptive approaches to research and development do not imply less need for collaboration between subject-matter specialists and research specialists. Just what administrative arrangements should be made to bring the two together in fruitful interaction from the very start of a course improvement program is a question outside my present topic. Cronbach has dealt with these matters, and his proposals ought to be considered for their applicability to the special situations existing in the field of English. The point must be made, however, that orientations and predilections for styles of research differ among specialists in educational research. Some psychologists are not comfortable with the flexible, cut-and-try patterns appropriate for the developmental phases of course improvement programs. Their traditions have inclined them more to the design of formal experiments for testing well elaborated hypotheses by means of highly refined measuring instruments. Teachers of English should seek collaborators among educational psychologists who have the inclination, temperament, and skill to use the wide variety of flexible, informal, cutting-and-trying, pilot study techniques that apply in developmental work.

Let me illustrate these remarks in relation to research on the role of formal grammar in teaching composition. The pattern for such work, as established over the last few years on mathematics and science curriculum improvement programs, would have called for a committee of English teachers to develop a new method of teaching formal grammar. They might devote several years to this program, writing and rewriting their text materials and workbooks and getting them tried out by teachers of English around the country. They would almost inevitably develop strong conviction about the value of their new method. Their enthusiasm would be caught by hundreds of other teachers, and large foundation grants might then be used to train these teachers in use of the new curriculum in grammar.

After a few years, the developmental and installation work, i.e., the work of preparing the program and materials and of training teachers in the use of them, would have proceeded enough to permit some relaxation and some afterthoughts. Does the new curriculum really improve the student's writing skill? Does it engender more favorable attitudes toward writing and greater appreciation of good writing?

At this point, in the traditional pattern, evaluation experts or educational psychologists, may be called in. They are asked to help design experiments and measurement techniques to evaluate the effectiveness of the new curriculum in grammar. The curriculum developers may well feel they are asking for trouble and may indeed be unconsciously resentful of what they feel themselves driven to undertake. And, to a large extent, we cannot blame them, for many if not all of the horses have already been stolen. Yet, as we know, curriculum developers are not the least courageous of men, and some of the new programs are currently at this self-punishing stage of undertaking to evaluate themselves.

The new approach to curriculum development, course improvement, and evaluation, as I see it, espoused by Professor Cronbach and others would call for the curriculum developers and research specialists to work hand in hand from the beginning. The curriculum developers will continue to use the intellectual reconstructions, impressions, insights, logic, informal observations, hunches, and opinions that they have used in developing curricula from time immemorial. Their ingenuity will be given full freedom to interact with the most profound grasp of their content. But the measurement and research specialist will stand alongside with his own points of view and techniques. He will continually press for translating goals into observable behaviors, for collecting opinions and behavioral evidence in the most reliable and valid way possible under the circumstances, for objectifying and standardizing teaching methods to the fullest extent possible without loss of educational values, for processing and interpreting data in useful and valid ways. By this pattern of collaboration, the two sides of the project will grow up together, and when they reach maturity, their offspring should be the better for it.

References

Campbell, D. T., and J. C. Stanley. "Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs in Research on Teaching." N. L. Gage, ed. *Handbook of Research on Teaching*. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963. Pp. 171-246.

Cronbach, L. J. *Evaluation for Course Improvement*. Urbana, 1962. (Mimeographed)

DeBoer, J. J. "Grammar in Language Teaching," *Elementary English*, 36 (1959). Pp. 413-421.

Steinberg, E. R., ed. *Needed Research in the Teaching of English: Proceedings of a Conference Held at the Carnegie Institute of Technology*. Pittsburgh, 1962. (Mimeographed)

EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY AND RESEARCH IN THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH

David H. Russell

Educational psychology is concerned with how we learn. Like a number of other disciplines it was born under the parental roof of philosophy, but, in early adolescence, left that home. Around the turn of the century, it was part of general psychology, an affiliation that remains, but by 1910 or so it had begun to establish some procedures and interests of its own. For the last forty or fifty years it has attempted to use an empirical approach in two main areas sometimes labeled (1) the psychology of learning or of education and (2) child and adolescent development.

In developing the two areas educational psychologists have attempted to apply "the scientific method" to problems of human behavior and development. We are all aware that there are difficulties in such an effort. We know some of the inadequacies of the method in getting at basic facts in complex and subtle human activities such as writing a clear paragraph or interpreting a poem. Educational psychologists, however, have insisted in going beyond the intuitions and logical analysis of the literary scholar to some sort of exact description of phenomena and empirical check on hypotheses. They have tried, in the words of President Kennedy, to avoid an indulgence in "the comfort of opinion without the discomfort of (verified) thought."

Since most of you work in other scholarly groups, may I add that the people engaged in such research are often found in the Educational Psychology or Child Development sections of the American Psychological Association, in the Society for Research in Child Development, or in the American Educational Research Association. Anyone interested in the discourse of the latter group, for example, should examine the one-volume Encyclopedia of Educational Research or the various issues of the Association's journal entitled The Review of Educational Research.

This may not be the place to expose the inadequacies of the discipline I am representing but I should not like you to feel that we blandly accept what we are doing. Instead, may I suggest that there is a feeling among many of us that all is not well in the domain of educational psychology. We have not been too successful in getting at a fundamental theory of learning. If I try an association test on you and say "psychology of learning" you may reply, "Oh yes, Pavlov's dog." This early study of simple conditioning is not so simple as we once thought it was and, furthermore, we think that learning by conditioning or association accounts for only a small part of the learning, especially the verbal learning, characteristic of most children and adults. When we get into discussions of learning these days we begin to talk about such concepts as "motivation," "maturation," "structuring," "reinforcement," "retention," and "evaluation." Now these words used by educational psychologists, however high-sounding, are not always very good scientific terms. They are blanket explanations indicating lack of knowledge and failure in precise definition of what we are studying.

Furthermore, educational psychologists have not always been asking the important questions. Until the last five years or so, when research funds in considerable amount were made available under NDEA and by some foundations, studies have usually been isolated, one-time attacks on little problems that could be managed by graduate students, school systems, or professors working individually within very modest budgets. Many of these projects were learning experiences for graduate students but their methodology was so naive, especially in two-group or parallel group teaching studies, that they made no contribution to theory or knowledge. For example, in one area in which I happen to work, that of learning to read, there are four or five thousand published and respectable studies, 98 per cent of which have had no impact whatever. Studies of the last fifty years have had comparatively little effect in originating new approaches to the teaching of reading. Among hundreds of investigations one seeks in vain for the cumulative continuity that has characterized research in the natural sciences. Fragmentary studies have sometimes involved use of doubtful statistical procedures to analyze data obtained from more doubtful reading tests and measurements. Such criticisms may be applied equally to other areas of language learning.

And yet, despite these and other weaknesses, I should like to emphasize today that some literary scholar-critics can use methods and results of psychological studies to illumine the various kinds of language learnings more clearly, and to bridge the present gap between studies in English and in educational psychology. It is not my purpose to stress the potential contributions of studies in literary scholarship to psychology. Some possibilities have been suggested by Lewis Leary (Columbia) and Reuben Brower (Harvard) and all of you here know more about the undeveloped resources of literary scholarship than I do. Rather, I prefer to emphasize some latencies in applying psychological approaches to the teaching of, and research in, English.

I commend the empirical, experimental approach to some problems in English aware of the fact that some people in education try to shut off discussion of parents or of scholars by the incantation "research says." We are all aware of what might be called the potential fraud in the term research. We should probably disagree on our definitions of the term although I hope for present purposes we can avoid such phrases as "the search for absolute truth" in favor of the more modest aim of "pushing forward the frontiers of knowledge." Furthermore, we need to put the word research in some frame of reference. I suggest to you that there is a sort of continuum in the ways we try to get at the best methods of learning and teaching English. From the public school point of view some seven approaches to the problem may be distinguished: Personal Opinion, Public Debate, Individual Experience, Demonstration, Action or Operational Research Research, Applied Research, Basic Research.

Influences on the Teaching of English

May I suggest that any one of these ways of obtaining knowledge is not necessarily better than any other. Indeed, on many problems, come combination of approaches may be best. May I add, however, that my bias is to move away from reliance on the first three approaches. It is high time we put more of our money and energy into the approaches mentioned last.

In advocating more emphasis upon research I am not suggesting that all problems of literary scholarship can be tackled that way. In a recent paper Northrop Frye suggested that there are three concerns in the study of literature: (1) the theory of literature--which is the domain of criticism, (2) the practice of literature--which is learning to write for oneself (usually not accomplished in university classes) and (3) the teaching and learning of literature--which has not always been the concern of university English departments. It is this third area for which I am especially recommending the empirical, "scientific" methods of educational psychology, although they may be applicable to the first two problems as well. The methods are not new in the study of some language phenomena, especially as they attempt to deal with observable language behavior. They go beyond the intuitive thinking and rational analysis of the literary scholar to some form of testing of hypotheses and verifying of conclusions. They are not the methods a young member of an English department would ordinarily use in the study of Milton or Andrew Marvell or Faulkner but they may apply to some of his other concerns. With this point of view one does not merely say that some skills in composition or some factual learnings in the history of English literature are accomplished as well in classes of 200 as in seminars of 15 students. Instead, one makes an objective statement of such possible facts, sets up experimental conditions and attempts control of variables, and then measures results as well as one knows how. This is fairly routine to most educational psychologists and they should be able to help an English instructor plan this or a hundred similar experiments, sometimes asking help from an expert in research design.

Some of you will question whether this so-called "scientific" approach to a problem can answer any of the important questions in English. I am not repudiating the historical method in studying literature or the modern criticism of explication de texte. I would even accept the phrase in Whittier's Snowbound, "The truth to flesh and sense unknown." I am aware of weaknesses in the experimental method, but I maintain that unless it is used to investigate many questions the scholar is likely to lapse into the autistic interpretation, the encrusted illusion and the duck-billed platitude.

May I illustrate by exploring in depth two topics which suggest the possibilities of reciprocal contributions of educational psychology and literary scholarship? The first attempts to establish some bases or guide lines for interaction and the second is an exploration of one of the most difficult and complex areas of mutual concern. I am deliberately omitting an application to teaching methods and attempting to explore the more difficult overlap of literature and psychology. If we can cooperate here we can probably do it in specific learning situations.

As a necessary foundation for research in psychology and literature may I first suggest that there are both similarities and differences in the purposes and content of these fields. The two disciplines have had common goals in developing insights about man's behavior but divergent approaches to the common goals. Today's high school or college student moving from his morning class in English to his afternoon class in psychology may seldom connect the two fields of study. The similarities and differences of the two fields, however, may both be productive in extending our knowledge of human aspiration and behavior. How are psychology and literature alike?

As Gordon Allport has suggested, the positive relations of the two fields may be stated in a number of ways. Both attempt to describe human lives not only in terms of overt action but in relation to personality. The developments of psychological science have often confirmed insights long achieved by writers. Othello came long before psychological descriptions of insecurity or jealousy. E. M. Forster has written, "Psychology is not new, but it has newly risen to the surface. Shakespeare was subconsciously aware of the subconscious." Reciprocally, psychological knowledge has aided modern writers in developing their characters and plotting the course of their conflicts and problems. It has aided biographers in assessing the roles of heredity and environment, in studying genius and in appraising the relationship of the individual to social movements. Thomas Mann's work reveals more knowledge of psychology than the Robin Hood stories. John Steinbeck has more psychological insight than Sir Walter Scott.

One of the complicating factors in establishing common ground for literature and psychology has been the considerable interest in literature of several branches of psychoanalytic thought. Although few American psychologists today support a Watsonian brand of behaviorism, they are less likely than many European psychologists to be influenced by psychoanalytic theory and they therefore tend to reject what they may call the "mythological terrain" of psychoanalytic concepts of literature. Freud himself was interested in folklore and literature and the tradition has been preserved in different schools of psychoanalysis. Rank, Reik, Bergler, and Fromm have all been interested in the problem. As you know, Freudian concepts have markedly influenced many American novelists and critics and at least one newsletter, Literature and Psychology, for some years illustrated psychoanalytical interest in literary works ranging from Homer to Kafka. Psychologists reared in the experimental tradition have been unable to accept the assumptions and conclusions resulting from psychoanalytic analyses of literary text and author's personality.

Any optimistic statement of the common interests of psychology and literature must also be tempered by a realistic appraisal of the differences in their methods. Although both are concerned with human life and thought their approaches to the study of them differ markedly. As Adams put it, "Literature is not watered down psychology; psychology is not methodized literature." Psychology may deal with specific facts like eye blink and the learning of nonsense syllables but literature is supposed to mean more than it says. The psychologist looks for logic and order in a situation; the artist, unfettered in imagination, knows that life does not proceed according to rules or logic. Like other sciences, psychology seeks verifiable general laws while literature deals with the fugitive truths of a specific person in a specific situation. Psychologists prefer observations which can be replicated, while the serious writer deals with analogy, metaphor and perhaps intentional ambiguity. Members of departments of English refer to a long history of insightful writing and subtle thinking about imagery, emotion, character and conflict. Psychologists must rely on relatively crude and isolated tests and experiments, not yet sufficiently developed to cope with man's understanding and use of some of the profound ideas and values of our culture. Literary works are not treatises on psychology. They embody stimuli, often of an intense nature, out of which psychological insights may arise.

In summary, research interrelationships might include studies in such areas as: (1) the psychology of the writer, (2) the psychology of the creative process, (3) the study of psychological types and behavior in literary works, and (4) the effects of literature on the reader. I am aware that many literary scholars and critics are not interested in such topics as the effects of literature on the reader. For example, Wellek and Warren say,

> The psychology of the reader, however interesting in itself or useful for pedagogical purposes, will always remain outside the subject of literary study--the concrete work of art. (*Theory of Literature*, p. 135)

And yet I would add that one of the most ancient and famous works of literary criticism, Aristotle's *Poetics*, contains the term *catharsis*, dealing essentially with the effects of literature on the reader.

The next example of possible collaboration between educational psychology and English I choose, first because I am interested in it and second, because it is probably one of the most difficult areas in which to attempt application of empirical methods. It deals with the response to literature which we sometimes describe as intangible or subtle or aesthetic or too delicate for the crude weapons of psychological research. And yet I believe that the area of interpretation of prose and other literature is one about which we may gradually obtain some objective data and thus increase our chances of developing critical abilities sequentially and thoroughly in both students and adults.

I describe the following studies not because they are individually excellent but because they illustrate an approach to a complex topic. During the last two or three years I have had four doctoral candidates who have been working on interpretation. (I hasten to add that they have been working fairly independently and that I did not choose their topics for them.) The first student, McNaughton, analyzed seventh-graders' responses to some passages which most of us would not call "literature"--they were factual, historical accounts of pioneer life in New Zealand and in America. McNaughton used content analysis of written responses to different questions to show that these pupils could answer questions on the same material at 5 different levels which he labeled: (1) copied facts, (2) qualified facts, (3) concrete concepts, (4) abstract concepts (such as "hardship") and (5) generalizations. The other important point here was that the level of response of the seventh-graders depended largely on the type of question asked by the teacher.

A second study just being completed by Skelton deals with the response of fifth and sixth graders to four poems of the sort usually found in elementary school readers or anthologies. From the ivory vantage point of the university one may argue that one has no interest whatever in what children say about some mediocre poems. The study probably makes a very modest contribution to our knowledge of the process of interpretation and criticism and yet it confirms our belief, for example, that most children of this age are pretty literal. Most of them say that the main idea of Robert Frost's poem "Two roads diverged in a yellow wood" is a man choosing one of two roads. Skelton, however, also finds that children of this age make more responses that he calls "reader-connotative" (idiosyncratic reactions) than those he calls "author-connotative" (attempts to interpret the author's hidden meanings). He gives some leads to ways of studying a poem with these children.

A third investigation by Scribner deals with the interpretation of some well-known poems by junior college freshmen, high school teachers of English, and well-known critics. Scribner points out some of the difficulties that freshmen have with poems like Blake's Tiger, Milton's On His Blindness, and even the easier Robinson's Richard Cory. She finds some of the expected differences among the three groups and, from hundreds of replies, gives some idea of patterns of response in students and teachers.

A fourth study just completed by Wilson was also a content analysis of the responses of college freshmen, this time to three novels: Steinbeck's Grapes of Wrath, Salinger's Catcher in the Rye, and Hemingway's Farewell to Arms. Students wrote freely about these books (some of them many pages) both before and after class discussion. Wilson not only categorized the type of response but was able to show objectively what many of us have always hoped--that the discussion of the books in a class made a difference in students' responses to them.

As I say, I mention these four studies not because they are particularly good, but because I happen to be involved in them and because they illustrate, I think, that some of the most difficult and intangible kinds of language behavior are amenable to empirical investigation. They are, in other words, examples of the kind of study in which cooperation between educational psychology and English may prove productive.

In the past ten years, some of the outstanding scientists of this country, usually working through the National Science Foundation, have made notable contributions to teaching and to research in science learning in elementary and secondary schools. Some of the best brains and literally millions of dollars have been put into such projects as the Physical Science Study Committee, the Chemical Bond Approach, the Chemical Education Materials Study, and the Biological Sciences Curriculum Study. Many of these scientists have had little or no recognition from their colleagues for this work and have taken time away from their own research. Is it time that we had a National Humanities Foundation? Is it time that more scholars in the humanities help those of us who work with children and adolescents in school? I should like to be so bold as to say that some scholars in English will find their own thinking, writing and teaching enriched by cooperative, experimental studies of different kinds of learning in language and literature.

Teaching is an art, and great teaching is a great art, but more and more it is an art which is based in part on hard, scientific evidence. The comparatively new discipline of psychology can help most in the process of getting at exact knowledge about the teaching and learning of English rather than detailing the knowledge itself. It can contribute a set of concepts about methods of study rather than giving final answers to problems. Language and literature are so diverse that we can advocate no one party line in discovering new knowledge. I plead for those who would test in classroom and experiment some of the intuitions of the literary scholar.

THE RELATIONSHIP OF ENGLISH EDUCATION AND RESEARCH IN THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH

Dwight L. Burton

One who is listed as the head of a department of English education may be in some peril in attending--to say nothing of addressing--a conference of heads of departments of English, but I appreciate the opportunity to do both. My convenient refuge, perhaps, may be found in the vagueness of the term, "English education." Said an English professor at a committee meeting within the National Council of Teachers of English not long ago, "What the hell *is* English education?" I can't deny the amorphousness of the term, and I must admit that some of what I might have said has been said already in this conference under the rubrics of English, research design, and educational psychology. My assignment, according to our program, is to discuss the responsibilities for research in the teaching of English of "other disciplines" related to educational psychology in departments of education. Of course, research under the label "education" might vary all the way from study of eye movements in reading to legal responsibilities in playground accidents of elementary teachers. Limitation is required, obviously, and I propose to limit my remarks to those responsibilities of people labeled specialists in the teaching of English or professors of English education.

Such people may be found in departments or schools of education, in departments of English, or they may be holders of joint appointments in English and education. It was somewhat surprising even to me to find, according to the last issue devoted to English of the *Review of Educational Research*,[1] that studies in English language learning had been carried on by members of departments of English, education, speech, psychology, sociology, linguistics, and anthropology. The field of English education, then, must have contact with many others.

The 1960 issue of the *Encyclopedia of Educational Research*[2] includes a total of 969 references in the teaching of English language and literature, reading, spelling, speech, and communication arts. I cite this as support for two assertions: (1) to date, despite some valuable work, much of the research in the teaching of English is of little significance or value, for reasons I shall try to identify shortly; (2) a major responsibility of the specialist in English education is to act as coordinator in interdisciplinary research; I hope that all I will say will support this idea. Truly important problems in the teaching of English can be probed, I think, only through an interdisciplinary approach.

---

[1] "Language Arts and Fine Arts," *Review of Educational Research*, XXXI, No. 2 (April, 1961).

[2] Cited in Ralph C. Staiger, "Research in the Language Arts," *Research Methods in the Language Arts* (National Council of Teachers of English, 1961), p. 7.

Research in the teaching of English is not a new undertaking. I have said that some valuable work has been done. I should like to devote a few minutes to discussing what has been done so far. Though we can disregard many individual studies, still, important guidelines have been established and some necessary genres of research have been developed. There are six of these:

1. Status studies and surveys. These have provided valuable information. For example, in 1957 William Dusel completed at Stanford a doctoral dissertation entitled "Professional Responsibilities of English Teachers and Conditions of Instruction in California Secondary Schools." His findings on the amount of time necessary in working with student writing caused a national furor, and his study was quoted in The National Interest and the Teaching of English.[3]

Alma Stensland at Wisconsin carried out a study to identify issues in the teaching of poetry in secondary schools.[4] Thurston Womack, in a Columbia dissertation, surveyed the attitudes of elementary, high school, and college teachers toward current English usage, finding the most conservative attitudes among older high school teachers in small towns.[5] Charles Alva at Stanford surveyed the status of structural grammar in the schools of California, finding that it did not have much status![6]

---

[3] The National Interest and the Teaching of English (National Council of Teachers of English, 1961).

[4] Alma Lee Stensland, Current Issues in the Teaching of Poetry in the Secondary Schools. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1958.

[5] William T. Womack, A Study of Teachers' Attitudes Toward Debatable Items of English Usage. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1957.

2. Historical studies. The second type of study, the historical, is common to many fields. For example, Donald Stahl carried out at Northwestern a study of the development of the English curriculum in the Chicago Public Schools from 1856 to 1958.[7] However, historical studies in the teaching of English are relatively rare.

3. Relational studies. Third, there are the studies of relationships of factors. These usually involve, at the less complex level, computation of statistical correlations among sets of scores on measures of different attributes or types of achievement. Or in the more complex studies, factor analysis is used to determine the weight of given factors on outcomes or achievement.

One of the most commonly cited of this type of study over the years is that involving the relationship between knowledge of grammar and ability in written composition. The correlations consistently are very low between the scores on measures so far used for each kind of ability. A particular peril of this type of study--one not easy to avoid--is the assumption that relationship is cause and effect when it is not. For example, because listening ability is positively related to political liberalism--as one study showed[8]--does not mean that listening can be improved necessarily by an emphasis on liberal political principles. Or to come to the more familiar: that ability in sentence diagramming is not highly related to ability to write sentences does not mean study of grammar may have no value in the teaching of writing.

---

[6] Charles Allen Alva, Descriptive Grammar in the Teaching of English: A Survey of Its Extent, Use, and Status in the Public High Schools of California. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1959.

[7] Donald Edgar Stahl, The Development of the English Curriculum in the Chicago Public High Schools from 1856 to 1958. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University, 1960.

[8] Ralph D. Nichols, "Factors in Listening Comprehension," Speech Monographs, XV (1948), pp. 154-163.

4. Analytical studies. There are then the analytical studies. These are of two kinds: first, analysis of content. Richard Alm's doctoral dissertation at Minnesota dealt with assumptions about human experience in selected novels written for and about adolescents.[9] Jean Malmstrom analyzed the validity of textbook statements about grammatical items in light of evidence from the Linguistic Atlas projects.[10] There have been, too, a number of analyses of faults in student writing. Some of these, unfortunately, have amounted to no more than counts of mechanical errors.

There is a second kind of analytical study: the cross-sectional or longitudinal analysis of data. Two important and well-known studies in English fit this category. Just published by Professor Ruth Strickland of Indiana University is a study of the language of elementary school children which concludes that the oral language children use is far more advanced than the language of the books from which they are taught to read.[11] Professor Walter Loban of the University of California has been carrying on for ten years a study of the language development of children, analyzing their writing structurally.[12] He plans to continue until his group is graduated from high school. Both these studies are subsidized by the United States Office of Education.

---

[9] Richard Sanford Alm, A Study of the Assumptions Concerning Human Experience Underlying Certain Works of Fiction Written for and about Adolescents. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1956.

[10] Jean Malmstrom, A Study of the Validity of Textbook Statements about Certain Controversial Grammatical Items in the Light of Evidence from the Linguistic Atlas. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1958.

[11] Ruth G. Strickland, The Language of Elementary School Children: Its Relationship to the Language of Reading Textbooks and the Quality of Reading of Selected Children. Bulletin of the School of Education, Indiana University, 38, 4 (July, 1962), p. 106.

[12] Walter Loban, "Language Ability in the Middle Grades." Report on Contract Research Number SAE 7289 to the U.S. Office of Education, March 1, 1961.

5. Case studies. The case study, in which a relatively few carefully selected individuals are studied intensively, has not been used frequently in research in the teaching of English. Harold Covell, however, of the University of British Columbia used case study technique in analyzing the characteristics of good and poor readers in the eleventh grade of one large high school.[13] A doctoral dissertation now in progress at my university is based on case studies of the reading behavior of intellectually able pupils in the upper elementary grades.

6. Experimental studies. Finally, there is the very important--and often disappointing--experimental study. Experimental research in the teaching of English, of course, compares outcomes in an experimental group with those in a matched control group. For example, a United States Office of Education-sponsored study by Edwin Sauer, then of the Harvard Graduate School of Education, compared the gains in writing made by classes taught by teachers aided by theme readers with classes taught by teachers without readers. The use of theme readers seemed to pay off.[14] The National Education Association, under a grant from the Dean Langmuir Foundation, this fall launched a five-year project which will test the following hypotheses in several high schools where experimental and control groups have been established:

(a) Students who write compositions in class learn to write better than students who do the same amount of writing as homework.

(b) Students who write a theme a week learn to write better than those who write (1) once every two weeks, (2) once a month.

(c) English teachers who use theme readers teach composition more effectively than other English teachers.

(d) The writing laboratory produces student writers who are more self-directing and independent in proofreading and revising their composition work than are students not trained in the laboratory.[15]

---

[13] Harold Manfred Covell, Characteristics of Excellent and Poor Readers of Social Studies Material in the Eleventh Grade. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, 1956.

[14] Main findings are reported in Paul M. Ford, "Lay Readers in the High School Composition Program: Some Statistics," English Journal, 50 (November, 1961), pp. 522-528.

Similarly, a study nearing completion at my university attempts to determine the relationship to progress in written composition of varying amounts of writing and different levels of intensity in evaluation of the writing.[16]

I said earlier that much of the research in the teaching of English has been of little help in establishing a true basis on which to make crucial decisions. This may be true of research in general; probably only a few of the studies in any field are truly significant. Yet the kinds of studies I have just identified are fraught with some particular pitfalls which the researchers often have not avoided. It is the responsibility of specialists in the teaching of English, or any researchers, to avoid certain common limitations and fallacies.

1. The first of these lies in the choice of subjects and hypotheses for research. Frequently the studies, especially of the experimental and relational types, have belabored trivial and obvious hypotheses. We may be less suspect here than people in some other areas. Recently I read the report of a study in physical education carried on at the Michigan State University of the problems in putting besetting the beginning golfer. A conclusion was that a smooth surface presents fewer putting problems to a neophyte golfer than does an undulating surface!

Dr. Ruth Strickland told the conference at the Carnegie Institute of Technology last May that "our need . . . is not for more statistical compilations to tell us how to do what we are doing. We know something about what children learn of what we attempt to teach them. We know little of what they could learn if we knew how and when to teach it to them."[17]

Unimaginative statisticians and educational psychologists must bear some of the blame for triviality in experimental studies. Frequently prospective researchers or graduate students are encouraged to drop a potentially significant study in favor of one that fits more perfectly a Latin Square design or some other formal statistical pattern.

---

[15] Arno Jewett, Project on the English Composition Laboratory (National Education Association, 1962), p. 12. (Mimeographed)

[16] Lois V. Arnold, Effects of Frequency of Writing and Intensity of Teacher Evaluation upon High School Students' Performance in Written Composition. (Doctoral study in progress at Florida State University.)

[17] Ruth G. Strickland, "Some Important Research Gaps in the Teaching of Elementary School Language Arts," Needed Research in the Teaching of English, Erwin R. Steinberg, ed. (Carnegie Institute of Technology, 1962), p. 12.

But there is another explanation that poses a greater challenge to us: we lack means of assessing progress in some aspects of English we think important. How, for example, shall we measure increased pleasure in the literary experience? We have found it difficult to agree on what good writing is, and thus more difficult to assess progress in writing. By "measuring" I do not mean necessarily the use of objective tests, of course. But if experimental and relational studies in the teaching of English are to gain in significance, scholars of literature, linguistics, rhetoric may find it profitable to work with psychometricians and statisticians and curriculum specialists in producing the valid measures on which all such studies must be based.

2. Too short a term of experimentation is a common failing of experimental studies. Such things as perception of form in literature or skill in expository writing develop slowly, and discernible changes do not occur in a few weeks. Some studies comparing approaches or the effect of different materials may be potentially significant but are doomed at the outset sometimes for lack of a longer-term test of hypotheses. But of course graduate students in a hurry to complete requirements and junior faculty members in a hurry to build a bibliography are loath to undertake three- or five-year studies.

3. Control of variables, of course, is a nemesis in research of the experimental or relational types. Experiments which compare teaching approaches are especially difficult, for there simply are many factors which may account for students' behavior and achievement in given situations. Inadequate control of variables has wrecked many studies. Statistical techniques and research design can help the scholar here. Many of the studies carried out with meticulous design but trivial in conception can be matched by those significant in conception but valueless because of improper or unsophisticated analysis.

4. The problem of controlling variables gives rise to the "Hawthorn effect" which dogs much research. That is, is the enthusiasm of the teacher or the novelty of a new approach or new materials producing the differences between the experimental and control groups, or are they caused by the experimental approach itself? In an effort to nullify this effect, some researchers

have devised ways of giving control groups special attention without altering the basic design.

5. Finally, research in the teaching of English reveals a limitation shared probably by other fields--a lack of follow-up or continuity. Promising studies have not been followed by others the results demand. There is a genuine need not merely for research but for planned programs of research that may involve a series of closely related studies.

Let me turn from the past and present to the future. I have said already that a special responsibility of specialists in English education may be that of mediator in interdisciplinary research. Team research is, I think, the answer to some of our problems. At one time it may be necessary for the linguist and elementary reading specialist to work together; at another, the specialist in the teaching of secondary English and the specialist in Renaissance literature.

The group discussing needed research in secondary school English at the Carnegie Tech conference last May proposed ten matters for investigation. These are listed in Dr. Steinberg's summary in the report of the proceedings which we all have. It seems obvious to me that each of these proposed investigations would require a team approach. Needed would be specialists in literature, linguistics, and composition; people thoroughly familiar with the high school English curriculum and the language learning of adolescents; psychologists and psychometricians.

I should like to propose a few specific possibilities for research on crucial problems, though I am sure that much of this may have been said, in one way or another, at the Pittsburgh conference or earlier at this one. Linguistics and composition have claimed greater research interest recently, but the teaching of literature needs attention, too. Research might be concerned with structure and sequence of the literature program. These two terms--"structure" and "sequence"--are highly fashionable these days, of course. The authors of a recent report edited by Northrop Frye suggest that "the different forms and recurrent themes . . . are, perhaps, the basic principles of structure in literature."[18] Mr. Frye himself suggests that there are four modes of "literary fiction"--romance, comedy, tragedy, and irony--and that "comedy and romance are the primary ones, and can be introduced to the youngest children. . . . Tragedy and irony are more difficult and belong chiefly to the secondary level."[19] What approaches to literature are most effective at various levels of the school? What elements of poetry, fiction, drama are meaningful at various stages in development of ability to read literature? The Nebraska Curriculum Center in English, financed under Project English, is working toward a spiral curriculum in literature. For example, a tentative unit introducing repetition as a literary device has been prepared for the second grade; there is an introduction to satire in the third grade. These matters are then considered in more complex ways in later grades.

---

[18] Northrop Frye, ed. Design for Learning (University of Toronto Press, 1962), p. 35.

The teaching of English language structure is in a state of ferment--and rightfully. For many years in the teaching of language we have followed assiduously the policy that what fails we must do more of. Teaching of traditional grammar seems to have failed in important respects. What shall be taught instead and in what sequence? Answers to this may come from concerted research by linguists, psychologists of language, and specialists in elementary and secondary English curriculum.

The need for linguists and elementary reading specialists to work together is cited frequently. Professor Ruth Strickland, in the study alluded to earlier, concludes that "children need help to recognize and understand the entire phonemic scheme of English, not only the basic phonemes that are built into morphemes but as the suprasegmental phonemes of pitch, stress, and juncture as they use them . . . in oral speech."[20] Dr. James Squire, in a talk before the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development expressed the hope that "some researcher will place before us a content analysis of the structures used in the major beginning (reading) series and compare these with the data from Loban and Strickland studies."[21]

The entire complicated problem of the interaction of speaking and writing is one that needs a concerted research attack. I have made some more extended comments on this in the talk included in the reports of the proceedings of the Pittsburgh conference.[22]

---

[19] Ibid., p. 10.

[20] Ruth G. Strickland, The Language of Elementary School Children: Its Relationship to the Language of Reading Textbooks and the Quality of Reading of Selected Children, op. cit., p. 106.

[21] James R. Squire, "New Directions in Language Learning," Elementary English, 39 (October, 1962), p. 540.

A puzzling question to most teachers is, "By what process do immature and ineffective writers become effective writers?" and we could add others: How can we apply theories of composition to the classroom? Can we establish a sequence in composition tasks? What approaches in rhetoric are most effective in written composition? Again I have discussed this last question more fully in the Pittsburgh talk.

In speaking of these possibilities for research, I have not been speaking necessarily as a representative of a school of education. In the kind of team research which I think might be most fruitful, the specialist in English education, no matter what his home may be administratively, has important responsibilities. I should like to make a few comments now on a general responsibility of people in schools or departments of education: the implementing in practice of research findings.

The relationship of research to practice is quite different in education from that in other endeavors. In industry, for example, findings from research are quickly put to work. Not so in education. Discovery of truth in learning is no guarantee of modification of school curricula or teaching methods. The teachers of America exert a conservative influence born of the many pressures upon them, pressures that affect their security and status. The relationship of research to practice in education is affected not only by problems intellectual but by problems sociological.

It is quite true, as John Fisher points out in the reprint from College English which we all have, that in some schools teachers of English have lost full control of the subject-matter of their courses. School boards, school administrators, and patriotic, political, religious, and civic organizations all have ideas about what should be taught and what should not be taught. Scholarship and research sometimes have little influence on these ideas. Our problem of modifying practice is much more complicated than that of presenting teachers with findings from research or even of demonstrating how much findings may be put to use.

I do not wish to labor what may be obvious. However, faculties of education can play a vital role in bridging the gap between research and practice. Despite sharp criticisms of certain aspects of professional education, schools and departments of education have close relationships with public school personnel in many communities. Many members of education faculties have taught in the public schools and know the situation thoroughly. Often they serve as consultants to public schools; they conduct extension courses and summer classes which enroll large numbers of teachers and administrators; they are active in local and state teacher organizations; they publish in journals which many teachers and administrators read. Professional educators can perform--if they will, and I think they will--an invaluable service in helping individual teachers and faculties surmount local obstacles in the service of scholarship and research in the teaching of English or any other subject.

---

[22] Dwight L. Burton, "Some Important Research Gaps in the Teaching of Secondary School English," Needed Research in the Teaching of English, Erwin R. Steinberg, ed. (Pittsburgh, 1962), p. 16.

Lest you detect a ring of pollyannaism in what I have said, let me assure you that I am aware that warfare exists among people in the academic world and will continue to exist. The scholar of language or literature will view with contempt, as he should, the wooly-minded generalist in education. The scholar in an area of professional education will castigate, as he should, the beady-eyed little pedant who prates of the lack of scholarship in education at the same time that he is revealing no trace of the scholarly approach in his own mouthings. Furthermore, though interdisciplinary warfare is common, I know of few departments of English _or_ education in which everyone is speaking to everyone else. For all departments are peopled by human beings.

I am convinced, though, that a mood of greater sophistication in attacking educational problems at all levels has come upon the country, and that it is through the cooperative research efforts of scholars who respect each others' spheres of competence that true progress in the teaching of English, or any other discipline, will be achieved.

ENGLISH PROFESSORS AND THE SCHOOLS

Jean H. Hagstrum

I can best throw light on my dark topic by providing a simple narrative of how the Curriculum Center at Northwestern University came into being.

For several years before we were given the federal grant a very few of us--only two, in fact--made regular contacts with our neighboring schools. But even these, though useful, were largely ad hoc, informal, and limited; we decided, as the demands for our help kept increasing, that we ought to work toward a plan. Our own energies needed direction, since it was clearly impossible for us to sit on the curriculum committee of every high school and junior high school in the greater Chicago area. When we were asked to apply for a grant under Project English, it seemed to some of us that we were being given the opportunity for the co-ordination of effort we had been seeking.

Our proposal laid stress on composition, particularly from the seventh grade to the sophomore year in high school. We were committed to examine what now goes on, to work closely with the School of Education, to consult with psychologists, and ultimately to recommend sequential curricula.

The reactions in the English Department were varied and interesting. There must have been considerable distrust, though it was unspoken, of federal money--both from conservatives who feared centralized control and from liberals who hated a defence dollar. Some were put off because the documents from Washington were riddled with gobbledygook; others feared that federal money would throw us out of balance and that pedagogy would become more important than scholarship. Those who did not worry about that trend were dismayed at the work that lay ahead; they knew on whom the tasks would fall and had reason to wonder if these would remain as thankless as they had been in the past.

Nevertheless, we went ahead, the application was accepted, and soon we were on the federal payroll.

Our first task was to establish formal relations with the schools. The Dean of the School of Education and I visited most of the major high schools and junior high schools in the area and found an almost unanimous and even pathetic desire to cooperate. We were commended for planning work in a much-neglected area--English generally, more precisely composition, about which almost nothing had ever been done. After our visits to the schools, we began stocking the shelves in a house the University gave us with curriculum guides and school texts. It is now theoretically possible for English professors to learn about the preparation of their students. A teacher of American literature can, by going to our library and conference room, find out exactly which texts are taught, in what order, and even with what emphasis. Very few have so far availed themselves of this opportunity, but the room is there and will be there for a long time. Its presence may create a sense of obligation.

Unlike Carnegie and Nebraska, we are starting from scratch. So far, we have done little more than to try to master the problems. We have decided to put emphasis on seventh and eighth grade, where, by universal consent, the need was greatest and where the voice of the English Department was faint indeed. We are also undertaking specific projects--on spelling and the use of the dictionary, for example,--projects that are not confined to any grade level.

From our very short experience, a few lessons can be learned.

1. For success there must be the closest cooperation between the Department of English and the School of Education. Our colleagues in Education have been courteous and cooperative and have properly looked to us for guidance in subject matter.

2. English professors who are heavily committed to teaching and scholarship cannot be pushed too soon into an unfamiliar world. Even those who will never work directly on the curriculum should be allowed to feel that what they do remains important. Not everyone in the profession needs to speak to the schools.

3. If the best insights of the best minds are to be made available to the schools, some machinery of cooperation that has not hitherto existed must be created. A curriculum center is one such means: it invites people to the University who have been shy about coming on their own; it makes it easier than before for the English professor to pay attention to what is going on outside his walls.

4. Those who are committed to helping the schools can become active too soon. There must be time for reading and reflection. An English chairman, who has in the past given only casual attention

to pedagogy, cannot be expected overnight to master the problem. He must be given time to read journals he has not read before, to digest research that looks foreign and unappetizing, to talk to people whose language is not his language, and then to write his recommendations in such a way that they have some chance of being accepted. His rhetoric must be adjusted to an entirely new situation, and he must know the realities of a world which he has perhaps hitherto ignored. To assume that all this can be done in a matter of weeks is to ask the impossible.

COORDINATING EFFORTS AND ORGANIZING ENGLISH DEPARTMENTS TO SUPPORT RESEARCH IN THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH ... or
CONFESSIONS OF AN EX-CHAIRMAN ... or
I WAS A TEEN-AGE CHAIRMAN--UNTIL I FOUND GOD (AND CHICAGO)

James E. Miller, Jr.

I am an intruder in your midst and feel uncomfortable. This is a meeting of chairmen and I am not a chairman. I am supposed to talk about English departments and I have just departed one and have not really become settled in another. In short, I do not belong where I am and I am uncertain of where I belong. Since it is best in this talk that I remain anonymous, I ask you--Call me Ishmael.

Before I left Nebraska, I was told I talked about Chicago too much. When I arrived in Chicago, I found that I was talking about Nebraska too much. I at first welcomed this opportunity to talk frankly about both places, until I learned that both Nebraska and Chicago would be present to listen.

I had thought at first I would begin with a definition of an English department chairman. But after long thought, I decided I did not know how to go about defining the term--at least in language that could be used in public. When I was a chairman, I discovered three radically different concepts of the office. Outside the university, among the managerial class, among the young men in gray flannel suits (in Nebraska referred to as the "O Street Gang"), there was the notion that a department chairman was a graying man in a worn flannel suit, whose status was roughly analogous to that of an earnest insurance salesman or department store buyer or ambitious bank clerk. These outsiders (because of my Army experience I tend to call them civilians) believed that a chairman had a staff of professors to act as his assistants--to type his letters or file his papers or shine his shoes, but that he really hadn't made the grade or he would be a dean or vice-chancellor.

This image of the chairman was echoed a bit in the image held by the administration of the university, but the analogy shifted from business to sports. The chairman was a member of the administrative team, he frequently had to carry the ball (particularly after it had been kicked about in the mud), he of course was never allowed to pitch but he always put his shoulder to the wheel and pulled his load, never resting for a moment on his oars. He was expected, of course, to bring any of his recalcitrant underlings, like waterboys, into line.

The third image of the department chairman, that held by the members of the department, is worth a book in itself. It cannot be done justice in such short space. One way, perhaps, of forming some impression of this image is to assemble in one place all the names the chairman has been called by the staff. But this may be not only difficult, since many of these are epithets muttered at inaudible levels, but also provocative, in view of the general public concern about obscenity. But some flavor of the esteem in which a chairman is held by his colleagues might be suggested by some of the responsibilities and activities which they delegate to him without demands for an accounting of any kind--for example, after a vigorous session in the coffee room, he might be left to wash the cups.

But, as we all know, deep down in our hearts, these images of the English chairman are all distorted. We know that he is harassed and hounded, blamed and cursed, prodded and kicked, deceived and denied--but his experience is exalting and transfiguring: he is turned into a better man, with a deeper wisdom, and a profounder judgment.

The other term of our title that challenges definition is research. In the sciences, definition is easy: research is an activity requiring a mass of complicated, expensive equipment, a reduced teaching load, and large sums of money from the government or foundations. It is, I think, highly significant that in universities, the forms used for applications for the support of research are invariably designed for the scientist, with much space provided for listing items of equipment and various kinds of secretarial and laboratory assistance. All that white space staring defiantly up at the humanist trying to get $25.00 for the typing of a manuscript is intimidating. I remember in my days as a chairman trying to help a distinguished, productive poet get some time off for a major work. He looked at the hostile application form and finally threw up his hands, saying, with a sense of both frustration and guilt, "But all I want to do is write a poem." It was perfectly obvious that the application form was unyielding in its opposition to poetry.

We might think that we could turn to graduate deans for a definition of research in English. But graduate deans are busy men and the longer they are in office, the more they tend to rely on mathematics for judgment. Research is that activity for support of which professors ask money, usually in great sums. In their reports, graduate deans are fond of comparing research applications in the sciences with research applications in the humanities--but never in dollars and cents. If applications in the sciences total 6 million, of which 4 million are granted, and if applications in the humanities total $431, of which $399.13 is granted, the dean is quick to point out that the humanities, in receiving 93% of their requests, are more generously supported than the sciences, receiving only 66%.

This statistical approach to research brings me around finally to the subject of my talk--research in the teaching of English. It is quite possible that this attitude of the graduate deans, and of university administrations in general, points to one of the simplest of our problems--the obtaining of money for research in the teaching of English. Indeed, in the simplicity of this problem lies also its danger. There are powerful forces in the higher levels of most universities so opposed to conventional research in English that they might welcome the opportunity to embarrass such research and even restrict it by granting all the available resources for the humanities to some practical projects dealing with realistic problems that will improve the spelling and grammar of students. To put it bluntly, research in Chaucer, Milton, and Melville might be passed over in order to support research in the teaching of composition, grammar, or rhetoric. It will take strong, articulate chairmen to prevent this from happening at many universities.

We frequently speak of English departments as though they were pretty much alike. In my career as student and teacher of English, I have had glimpses at some five English departments, all radically different from each other. My most recent experience has enabled me to compare two quite different departments confronted with entirely different kinds of problems in supplying the various kinds of resources needed for research in the teaching of English.

At Nebraska, a medium sized state university with a unified English department, there were three elements at work to make possible the launching of some specific research projects in the teaching of English. In the first place, there was concern in the state for the quality of education students were getting in their English classes. This concern arose for many causes--including the national impact of NCTE's _The National Interest and the Teaching of English_ and the local impact of various statements circulated by the Nebraska Council of Teachers of English. But perhaps the most direct cause was the simple recognition of the relationship of language use to social and economic status. The concern in the state took concrete form in the willingness of a local foundation--the Woods Charitable Foundation--to give money to support two successive summer workshops or institutes which brought together teachers of English from elementary, secondary, and college levels to prepare experiments in the English curriculum.

A second element creating a favorable climate for support of such research was the attitude of the administration of the University. For whatever reason, there was enthusiastic support for the summer institutes and other activities in pedagogical research which the Department of English was initiating. It should be added, however, that this administrative support became most vocal and inspired after the various news media began generating excitement about the projects underway. In short, research in the teaching of English, quite unlike conventional research in English, is loaded with potential public interest that manifests itself in TV and radio commentary as well as news stories and editorials--and even Sunday features. However misguided this public interest is (and there are hints that behind it is a fervent belief that English teaching must return to spelling and grammar drill)--however misguided it might be, it can be exploited to arouse the avid interest of the most apathetic university administration.

The third and perhaps key element rendering possible the various projects at Nebraska was the attitude or atmosphere in the Department of English. My guess is that a crucial element in the creation of that atmosphere was that there was not just one avenue to promotion and salary increase--the conventional publication of conventional research--but several avenues. Among these avenues, activities in promoting better English teaching was certainly important. I hasten to add, however, that no one in the department became engaged in these activities in search of promotion and salary increase. They became involved, however, with the assurance that should they continue in this direction it would be no dead end for them. As it turns out, the two key people involved, a linguist who was the director of freshman English (Dudley Bailey) and a medievalist who was chairman of the committee for graduate studies (Paul Olson), have leaves of absence this year to pursue research in their areas of basic interest.

In looking back at the way the Nebraska Department of English became deeply involved in the summer workshops and a Project English Curriculum Center, the one thing that seems clear is that the initiation or motivation did not come out of any gimmick of coordination or organization. Rather, the Department's involvement came about because particular individuals became fired with the desire to do something concrete and specific about the plight of the English curriculum in Nebraska's schools. These individuals were genuinely concerned enough to take the time to write out proposals, approach foundations, plead for money, and perform an endless number of time-consuming chores. In bringing about a state of mind in Nebraska which made cooperation on any such research possible Dudley Bailey spent large amounts of time and energy working with and in the Nebraska Council of Teachers of English.

In capitalizing on this state of mind and working out a proposal for the Nebraska English Curriculum Center, Paul Olson consulted extensively with Nebraska's Teachers College, the State Office of Education, the administrations of five public school systems (including Lincoln and Omaha), and the teachers of English from every level of the school system. Other members of the department helped--but the point is that the motivation came from the staff members involved. There was no master plan of organization. Plans were improvised with each operation, and opportunities seized by the man most deeply interested and fully prepared. Now, of course, with the Nebraska Curriculum Center established for five years, a comprehensive plan of operation has been drawn up under the management of the director, Frank Rice.

The ambition of the Nebraska plan is to create an articulated curriculum from kindergarten through grade 13. This year experimental materials, prepared at last summer's workshop, are being tried out in grades 1, 4, 7, and 10. Four additional grades will be added each year until all the grades are covered, and each summer new materials will be prepared and the tested materials revised. The English Curriculum Center is housed with the Department of English, the director a member of the Department's staff. I am sure that the director feels free to call upon his colleagues for advice, help, and assistance.

In turning from the University of Nebraska to Chicago, I find the circumstances radically different. In a private institution, there does not seem to be the sense of responsibility for the condition of public education throughout the state or region. In an institution whose graduate program is double the size of its undergraduate program, there is a feeling of departmental remoteness, not only from the high schools but also from the college freshmen and sophomores. In an institution in which the Divisional Department of English--graduate level--is separated administratively, by budget, from the undergraduate college English staff, there is a chasm in the academic structure which seems almost too wide to span. But in the face of all these difficulties, there are favorable signs at Chicago. The most dramatic of these has been the endowment of the Pullman Chair of English, which Wayne Booth now holds. In the provisions of the endowment, the Pullman Professor is asked to concern himself with the improvement of student composition. This single factor may well prove the catalyst that alters radically the various elements in the Chicago situation.

I would like to turn back now to my Nebraska experience, to an incident which might stand as a warning to the precarious state of our profession. After we had been granted the Project English Curriculum Center and had worked out in elaborate detail a plan of organization, we began looking about for a director. The individuals who had been instrumental in proposing, obtaining, and setting up the Center had taken time from their major areas of research interest. They were understandably not anxious to devote their careers and their lives to a project outside their primary interest and training. Indeed, in the comprehensive sense, they were not qualified for the job. Their training had been in the very specialized areas of English, areas which had little real relevance to the basic problems of a curriculum center.

In searching for a qualified director of Nebraska's Curriculum Center, I quickly became convinced that there was something radically wrong with our profession--not just with English, but with the entire system of graduate education. I could find many specialists in education, with concentrations in elementary or secondary education, and I could find many specialists in English, with concentrations in American or Elizabethan or 18th Century literature. But I could find no one with the kind of training that fitted him for the post of director of an English Curriculum Center. As a postscript I should add that we settled finally on the chairman of a Nebraska high school English department who had long experience and intimate acquaintance with Nebraska schools.

But we were lucky, I think. And I am convinced that the profession cannot continue to trust to its luck. Now it is true that there are only six English Curriculum Centers and that the whole system of graduate education should not be revised to produce six persons requiring special training. But the bitter truth is that neither education departments nor English departments are training their graduate students for the world in which they are going to live. There are, in fact, many positions throughout the country--in city school systems, in state offices of education, in colleges and universities--positions which should be filled by individuals with solid training in English and with a firm grasp on educational methods and psychology. But such people are practically non-existent.

The cause for this scarcity lies in the vast distance, on every university campus, between English departments and education departments. This distance has in effect crippled the profession. In their isolation one from another, these departments continue to produce individuals essentially unqualified for the jobs they are trained to take.

It has become a commonplace observation that a new Ph.D. in English is much better qualified to take over a graduate seminar in Spenser or Milton than to teach courses in freshman composition, sophomore literature, or grammar for the high school teachers--courses he seems bound to begin with, and perhaps stay with for his career. How long can graduate education continue this unrealistic course?

I would suggest that the time has arrived for another adjustment in graduate English education. I say another because we have been flexible enough in the past to make drastic adjustments to inevitable realities. When we were once rigorously historical, we saw the need to become more critical, and we weathered the new critical revolution by taking the new critics to our bosom. There was a time when creative writers were outside the pale, but most English departments now harbor poets, dramatists, and novelists.

Is it not time now for English departments to take over as their own some areas of English education? Is it not time for English departments to produce the individuals prepared to take posts as directors of curriculum centers as well as state English curriculum advisers and planners? Is it not, perhaps, time to recognize that university English departments are the proper offices of higher education to produce chairmen of high school English departments?

In short, is it not time for English departments to accept, alongside historical and biographical scholarship, alongside interpretive and analytical criticism, alongside imaginative and creative writing--to accept genuine research in the teaching of English as appropriate--and even vital--to their interests and functions?

If English departments recognized their responsibility in this area and developed their staffs accordingly, they would end their isolation from the profession and assume the leadership they should be taking.

I shall conclude by outlining a brief proposal I would like to see some secure and respectable English graduate program submit to Project English:

1. Let us recruit by generous scholarship offers a number of Ph.D. candidates from bright high school teachers who have 4 or 5 years of teaching experience.

2. Let us train these students solidly in English, with only minor modifications of our present Ph.D. programs.

3. Let us give them a little more work in psychology and methodology.

4. Let us permit their dissertation topics to relate to their profession of teaching (the teaching of literature, the application of linguistics to the teaching of composition, theories of rhetoric).

5. On completion of their work, let us rush this new brand of English Ph.D.'s in to fill the vacuum of informed leadership that now exists in the profession.

I believe such a program would have an important effect on the students it produced. But perhaps of more significance would be the profound effect the program would have on the department undertaking it. Any such department would find itself deeply involved--as it should be--in the basic and far-reaching problems of the profession.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT A SEMINAR OF ENGLISH DEPARTMENT CHAIRMEN

Held at Allerton Park, December 2-4, 1962

The general obligation of the profession

1. The preparation of teachers of English and their continuing education as teachers are among the important responsibilities of college and university departments of English. These responsibilities may call for the development of sustained programs of teacher education. Departments should regularly review and evaluate their training programs for teaching assistants and their courses designed for the preparation of high school teachers. Such efforts to strengthen the teaching of English should be accepted as professional obligations; hence their vigorous promotion should not be contingent upon the receipt of federal funds.

Activities within the individual institution

2. English teachers returning for post-baccalaureate study should be encouraged to enroll in courses in English and American literature and language. For those teachers who are ineligible to enroll in graduate degree programs, English departments should consider providing suitable courses and special graduate certificates.

3. The teaching of English and research in teaching will profit from joint efforts by specialists in English, English education, psychology, and other areas, and from cooperation, wherever this is appropriate, with such agencies as the United States Office of Education, state departments of education, and local schools and school systems.

4. Research in teaching and in the instruction of teachers can contribute to the same ends as a liberal discipline, inasmuch as teaching brings into focus the issues of literary and linguistic theory. Faculty members engaged in research in the teaching of English should be considered eligible for any reduction in teaching loads that is available for those engaged in literary or linguistic research, and the results should be evaluated by criteria comparable to those applied in literary and linguistic disciplines.

5. Teachers of English education should hold appointments in English departments whenever possible.

Activities involving other groups

6. College and university departments of English should expand their programs of cooperation with elementary and secondary school teachers of English by providing, for example, more departmental consultants who will work with the schools and by developing special programs for teachers such as summer workshops, institutes, seminars during the regular academic year, and special conferences.

7. Continued support should be sought from federal and other agencies, as well as from university and college administrations for:

(a) Summer institutes for teachers of English, patterned in general after those offered in 1962 under the sponsorship of the Commission on English of the College Entrance Examination Board.

(b) Seminars patterned in general after those sponsored by the Commission on English in 1961 for college and university teachers of English who are preparing to serve as directors and instructors in institutes or in-service training programs.

(c) Institutes, courses, and demonstrations in English language, composition, and literature (with or without credit) for elementary and secondary school teachers in service.

(d) Seminars enabling college teachers of English to extend their knowledge of literature and language.

(e) The preparation and production of printed and audio-visual materials for use in teacher-training programs.

Organization of chairmen

8. The chairmen of college and university English departments should organize at the state or regional, and national levels for the purpose of (a) formulating policy as to the conduct of English departments; (b) disseminating information on the teaching of English through conferences, meetings, journals, and special publications; and (c) undertaking concerted action to insure that the views of official representatives of college and university departments of English are effectively presented to the leaders in education and public affairs who make decisions affecting the teaching of English.

9. The chairmen of college and university English departments organized in a permanent national association, though autonomous and independent, should work, where this is an appropriate way of achieving professional ends, with such existing organizations as the Modern Language Association, the National Council of Teachers of English, the College English Association, the College Language Association, the Conference on College Composition and Communication, and the American Studies Association.

Dissemination of information

10. Members of college and university English departments should have ready access to reliable and selective information on important new books, articles, and reports of research on the teaching of English. Recommended lists of such publications should be printed regularly in professional journals; and a committee well qualified in the field should be established to provide commentaries on important titles.

The Allerton Park Seminar

11. The proceedings of the Allerton Park Seminar should be printed and widely distributed. The chairmen of college and university English departments attending the seminar should assume responsibility for disseminating to their fellow department chairmen the ideas and recommendations discussed.

These recommendations were approved by unanimous or almost unanimous votes of the following persons representing themselves, not their departments:

Albrecht, William P. -	University of Kansas
Archer, Jerome -	Marquette University
Bailey, Dudley -	University of Nebraska
Baker, Orville -	Northern Illinois University
Barber, C. L. -	Indiana University
Berman, Morton -	Boston University
Bogorad, S. N. -	University of Vermont
Booth, Wayne -	University of Chicago
Bowers, Fredson -	University of Virginia
Brogan, H. O. -	University of Massachusetts
Burton, Dwight -	Florida State University

Clark, John Williams - University of Minnesota
Cline, C. L. - University of Texas
Cosper, Russell - Purdue University
Cummings, Sherwood - University of South Dakota

Dick, Hugh - University of California
Dykema, Karl W. - Youngstown University

Ekstrom, William - University of Louisville

Faulkner, Claude - University of Arkansas
Fisher, John - Modern Language Association
Fogle, Richard - Tulane University
Ford, George H. - University of Rochester
Ford, Nick Aaron - Morgan State College
Friedrich, Gerhard - Orange State College

Gerrietts, John - Loyola University, Chicago
Gerber, John - University of Iowa
Gloster, Hugh M. - Hampton Institute
Gorrell, Robert - University of Nevada
Grey, Lennox - Teachers College, Columbia
Gwynn, Frederick L. - Trinity College, Hartford

Hagstrum, Jean - Northwestern University
Heilman, Robert - University of Washington
Hendricks, King - Utah State University
Hook, J. N. - Coordinator, Project English
Hove, John - University of North Dakota
Hunter, William B. - University of Idaho

Leary, Lewis - Columbia University

McKiernan, John - College of St. Thomas, St. Paul
McMillan, James - University of Alabama
McNamee, Maurice - St. Louis University

Marckwardt, Albert H. - University of Michigan
Martin, Harold C. - Harvard University
Melton, John L. - John Carroll University
Miller, James E. - University of Chicago
Murphy, Charles - University of Maryland

Ogilvy, J. D. A. - University of Colorado
Oliver, Kenneth - Occidental College

Portnoff, Collice - Arizona State University

Ray, Charles A. - North Carolina College
Rice, Warner - University of Michigan
Rich, Townsend - New York State Teachers College, Albany
Rusk, Elizabeth - Michigan State University
Russell, David H. - University of California
Ryan, Alvan - University of Notre Dame
Ryan, Lawrence - Stanford University

Sale, William M. - Cornell University
Sams, Henry - Pennsylvania State University
Schneider, W. B. - Southern Illinois University
Schorer, Mark - University of California
Schiffman, Joseph - Dickinson College
Schueller, Herbert - Wayne State University
Sears, Donald A. - Skidmore College
Simonini, Rinaldo - Longwood College

Sister Mary Chrysostom - Mt. Mary College, Milwaukee
Sister Mary Sylvia - Mt. St. Joseph Teachers College, Buffalo
Slater, Joseph - Colgate University
Slaughter, Eugene - Southeastern State College, Oklahoma
Smock, George - Indiana State Teachers College
Squire, James - National Council of Teachers of English
Steinberg, Erwin - Carnegie Institute of Technology
Stevens, A. Wilber - Idaho State College
Stone, Edward - Ohio University, Athens
Stone, George Winchester - Modern Language Association
Sutcliffe, Denham - Kenyon College
Svendsen, Kester - University of Oregon

Taylor, Ivan - Howard University
Templeman, William - University of Southern California
Townsend, F. G. - Florida State University
Turner, Arlin - Duke University
Tuttle, Donald - Office of Education, Washington, D.C.

Ward, William S. - University of Kentucky
White, Helen C. - University of Wisconsin
Wiley, Autrey Nell - Texas Woman's University
Williams, Cecil - Texas Christian University
Wright, Austin - Carnegie Institute of Technology

Robert W. Rogers
University of Illinois
Conference Chairman

3

PROGRAM OF MEETINGS
SUNDAY, DECEMBER 2

Session I - Sunday Afternoon - 2:30 p.m. - 5:30 p.m.

1. "The Relation of College English Departments in Relation to Other Groups Interested in Research in the Teaching of English"
   --James R. Squire, Executive Secretary, NCTE

2. "The Responsibility of College English Departments for Research in the Teaching of English"
   --John Fisher, Associate Executive Secretary, MLA

3. "What Cooperative Research Can Do for English Teaching: What It Is Doing for Other Fields"
   --Francis Ianni, Acting Director, Cooperative Research Division, Office of Education

Session II - Sunday Evening - 7:30 p.m. - 9:30 p.m.

1. "Research Imperatives Identified by the Conference at Carnegie Institute of Technology"
   --Erwin Steinberg, Carnegie Institute of Technology

2. "The Present Status of Research in the Teaching of English"
   --George Winchester Stone, Jr., Executive Secretary, MLA

Discussion

MONDAY, DECEMBER 3

Session III - Monday Morning - 9:00 a.m. - 11:30 a.m.

What College English Departments Can Do by Way of Research in the Teaching of Different Aspects of Our Subject

a. "Composition and Rhetoric" -- Harold C. Martin, Harvard University

b. "Language and Linguistics" -- Albert H. Marckwardt, University of Michigan

c. "Reading and Literature" -- J. N. Hook, University of Illinois

"Research Design with Special Reference to the Teaching of English"
-- Nathaniel L. Gage, Stanford University

Discussion

Session IV - Monday Afternoon - 1:30 p.m. - 4:30 p.m.

First sessions of four study groups:

A. (Butternut Room) Problems in Administration Created by Demands for Such Research (publication, promotion, involvement of faculty, load, released time, preparation of teachers and researchers, etc.)

B. (Front Porch) Planning Programs Involving Research in the Teaching of English (MATE programs, Ph.D. in Teaching of English, Masters in Applied Linguistics, preparation of teachers, etc.)

C. (Pine Room) Dissemination through Liaison Activities (articulation conferences, bulletins and newsletters, relations with other departments, providing consultant helps to schools, participating in state and community activities)

D. (Library) Dissemination through Institutes, Seminars, and Organized Instructional Classes (summer institutes, extension courses, seminars for teachers, workshops, fellowship programs, etc.)

Session V - Monday Evening - 7:00 p.m. - 9:30 p.m.

The Responsibilities of College English Departments

"Research in Educational Psychology"
--David H. Russell, University of California

"Research in Other Related Disciplines"
--Dwight Burton, Florida State University

Discussion

8:30 - 9:30 - Study Groups - second session

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 4

Session VI - Tuesday Morning - 9:00 a.m. - 11:30 a.m.

9:00 - 10:30 General Session

"Coordinating Efforts and Organizing English Departments to Support Research in the Teaching of English"
--Jean Hagstrum, Northwestern University
--James E. Miller, Jr., University of Chicago, Editor of *College English*

Discussion

10:30 - 11:30 Study Groups - third and final session

Session VII - Tuesday Afternoon - 1:00 p.m. - 3:00 p.m.

Reports and Recommendations from Study Groups

Discussion and Conclusion